



PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

CALL TO ORDER: COMMISSIONERS' BRIEFING, 5:34 P.M. in Council Chambers Conference Room of City Hall, 400 Stewart Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada

MINUTES:

PRESENT: CHAIRMAN CRAIG GALATI AND MEMBERS RICHARD TRUESDELL, MICHAEL BUCKLEY, STEVEN EVANS, BYRON GOYNES, LAURA McSWAIN AND STEPHEN QUINN

ALSO PRESENT: ROBERT GENZER - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DEPT., CHRIS GLORE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DEPT., MARGO WHEELER - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DEPT., ANDREW REED - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DEPT., SCOTT ALBRIGHT - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DEPT., TROY JESCHKE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DEPT., BART ANDERSON - PUBLIC WORKS, QIONG LIU - PUBLIC WORKS, BRAD JERBIC - CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, BRYAN SCOTT - CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, VICKY DARLING - CITY CLERK'S OFFICE, DEENY ARAUJO - CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

ITEM 5 [GPA-0045-00]

CHRIS GLORE, Planning & Development, advised that this matter pertaining to the Campaign rezoning would have to be abeyed to 2/28/2002 Planning Commission meeting in order to renotify. COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY questioned why the previous application that was denied was not reflected in the staff report. MR. GLORE responded that applications removed from the agenda are treated as if they never existed. Only those on which there is action are included in the staff reports. ROBERT GENZER, Director of Planning & Development, commented that the application for this item does not match the agenda and staff has never seen any amendment. It is a very sensitive application and includes a strip which the application has no intention of doing anything with. The only purpose of this request is to put up a billboard.

ITEMS 6 [V-0058-01] and 7 [Z-0057-01(1)]

ANDREW REED, Planning and Development, began the Briefing by saying that the applicant has applied for an additional variance and that these items should be held in abeyance until they may be heard concurrently with that application on 3/14/2002.

ITEMS 8 [U-0159-01] & 9 [SD-0079-01]

MR. REED advised that the applicant has requested a second abeyance of these items to the 3/14/2002 Planning Commission meeting. Staff feels that nothing would be gained by such a delay and recommended that the items go forward for action by the Planning Commission at this time.

City of Las Vegas

PLANNING COMMISSIONERS BRIEFING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002

MINUTES:

ITEM 10 [VAC-0045-01]

MR. REED explained that renotification was required for this Vacation application and that the matter would have to be abeyed to the 2/28/2002 Planning Commission meeting.

ITEM 11 [Z-0020-97(33)]

MR. GLORE and COMMISSIONER EVANS discussed that there were no questions regarding the medical district.

ITEM 32 [U-0001-02]

MR. REED clarified that this item reflected recommendations for both approval and denial. The correct recommendation is for approval.

ITEMS 35 [Z-0076-98(26)], 36 [Z-0093-00(4)], 44 [SD-0029-01(1)] and 46 [Z-0093-00(3)]

MR. GLORE noted that these items should all be final action and would not go forward to City Council.

ITEM 45 [SD-0072-01]

MR. REED requested that this item be held in abeyance so that it can be considered together with the companion Variance scheduled to be heard at the 3/14/2002 Planning Commission meeting.

ITEMS 50 [TA-0038-01], 51 [TA0040-01] and 52 [TA-0001-02]

CHAIRMAN GALATI advised that he would pull forward these items in order to accommodate MR. BROADBENT who was present to speak on them.

BRIEFING ADJOURNED AT 5:44 P.M.



PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

ALL ITEMS ON THIS AGENDA ARE SCHEDULED FOR ACTION UNLESS SPECIFICALLY NOTED OTHERWISE.

THESE PROCEEDINGS ARE BEING PRESENTED LIVE ON KCLV, CABLE CHANNEL 2. THE PROCEEDINGS WILL BE REBROADCAST ON KCLV CHANNEL 2 ON SATURDAY AT 10:00 A.M., TUESDAY AT 12:00 A.M., 11:30 A.M., AND THE FOLLOWING THURSDAY AT 6:00 P.M.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE was led by COMMISSIONER EVANS.

CALL TO ORDER: 6:04 P.M. in Council Chambers of City Hall, 400 Stewart Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada

ANNOUNCEMENT RE: COMPLIANCE WITH OPEN MEETING LAW

MINUTES:

PRESENT: CHAIRMAN CRAIG GALATI AND MEMBERS RICHARD TRUESDELL, MICHAEL BUCKLEY, STEVEN EVANS, BYRON GOYNES, LAURA McSWAIN AND STEPHEN QUINN

ALSO PRESENT: ROBERT GENZER - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DEPT., CHRIS GLORE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DEPT., MARGO WHEELER - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DEPT., ANDREW REED - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DEPT., SCOTT ALBRIGHT - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DEPT., TROY JESCHKE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DEPT., BART ANDERSON - PUBLIC WORKS, QIONG LIU - PUBLIC WORKS, BRAD JERBIC - CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, BRYAN SCOTT - CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, VICKY DARLING - CITY CLERK'S OFFICE, DEENY ARAUJO - CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

(6:04)

1-1



AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

SUBJECT:

Approval of the minutes of the January 10, 2002 Planning Commission Meeting

MOTION:

TRUESDELL - APPROVED - UNANIMOUS

MINUTES:

There was no discussion.

(6:04 - 6:08)

1-48



AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

ACTIONS:

ALL ACTIONS ON TENTATIVE AND FINAL SUBDIVISION MAPS ARE FINAL UNLESS AN APPEAL IS FILED BY THE APPLICANT OR AN AGGRIEVED PERSON, OR A REVIEW IS REQUESTED BY A MEMBER OF THE CITY COUNCIL WITHIN SEVEN DAYS OF THE DATE NOTICE IS SENT TO THE APPLICANT. UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED DURING THE MEETING, ALL OTHER ACTIONS BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION ARE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE CITY COUNCIL, IN WHICH CASE ALL FINAL DECISIONS, CONDITIONS, STIPULATIONS OR LIMITATIONS ARE MADE BY THE CITY COUNCIL.

ANY ITEM LISTED IN THIS AGENDA MAY BE TAKEN OUT OF ORDER IF SO REQUESTED BY THE APPLICANT, STAFF, OR A MEMBER OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION. THE PLANNING COMMISSION MAY IMPOSE TIME LIMITATIONS, AS NECESSARY, ON THOSE PERSONS WISHING TO BE HEARD ON ANY AGENDAED ITEM.



PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING RULES OF CONDUCT.

1. Staff will present each item to the Commission in order as shown on the agenda, along with a recommendation and suggested conditions of approval, if appropriate.
2. The applicant is asked to be at the public microphone during the staff presentation. When the staff presentation is complete, the applicant should state his name and address, and indicate whether or not he accepts staff's conditions of approval.
3. If areas of concern are known in advance, or if the applicant does not accept staff's conditions, the applicant or his representative is invited to make a brief presentation of his item with emphasis on any items of concern.
4. Persons other than the applicant who support the request are invited to make brief statements after the applicant. If more than one supporter is present, comments should not be repetitive. A representative is welcome to speak and indicate that he speaks for others in the audience who share his view.
5. Objectors to the item will be heard after the applicant and any other supporters. All who wish to speak will be heard, but in the interest of time it is suggested that representatives be selected who can summarize the views of any groups of interested parties.
6. After all objectors' input has been received, the applicant will be invited to respond to any new issues raised.
7. Following the applicant's response, the public hearing will be closed; Commissioners will discuss the item amongst themselves, ask any questions they feel are appropriate, and proceed to a motion and decision on the matter.
8. Letters, petitions, photographs and other submissions to the Commission will be retained for the record. Large maps, models and other materials may be displayed to the Commission from the microphone area, but need not be handed in for the record unless requested by the Commission.

As a courtesy, we would also ask those not speaking to be seated and not interrupt the speaker or the Commission. We appreciate your courtesy and hope you will help us make your visit with the Commission a good and fair experience.

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☒

CONSENT

☐

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

TM-0001-02 - TULESPRINGS VILLAGE - ALBERTSON'S, INC. ON BEHALF OF LAURICH PROPERTIES - Request for a Tentative Map for one lot on 26.76 Acres adjacent to the northwest corner of Farm and Tule Springs Road, T-C (Town Center) Zone, Ward 6 (Mack)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

0

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

0

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to conditions.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

QUINN - Motion to APPROVE Items 1, 3 and 4, subject to staff's conditions – Motion carried with TRUESELLE abstaining on Item 1 because he is currently working with Laurich Properties

This is final action.

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI stated this is a Consent item.

There was no discussion.

(6:04 – 6:06)

1-318

CONDITIONS:

Planning and Development

1. Approval of the Tentative Map shall be for no more than two (2) years. If a Final Map is not recorded on all or a portion of the area embraced by the Tentative Map within two (2) years of the approval of the Tentative Map, a new Tentative Map must be filed.
2. All development shall conform to the Conditions of Approval for Site Development Plan Review [Z-0076-98(14)] and the Town Center Plan and Development Standards.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 1 – TM-0001-02

CONDITIONS - Continued:

3. A multi-use transportation trail, meeting requirements of the Transportation Trails Element, shall be provided along the west side of Tule Springs Drive and along the north side of the property. The property for the trail path is to be deeded to the City, unless the property owner chooses to retain ownership of this property by submitting a letter to the City stating his intentions.
4. Street names must be provided in accordance with the City's street naming regulations.
5. All development is subject to the conditions of City departments and State Subdivision Statutes.
6. A fully operational fire protection system, including fire apparatus roads, fire hydrants and water supply, shall be installed and shall be functioning prior to construction of any combustible structures.

Public Works

7. Dedicate appropriate right-of-way adjacent to this site for bus turn-outs on Durango Drive and Farm Road and also an appropriate radius corner at the northwest corner of Durango Drive and Farm Road.
8. Identify the on-site sewer by one of the following three notes:

On-site sewers are public within 20-foot dedicated public sewer easements.

On-site sewers are privately owned per the CC&R's of this commercial subdivision.

On-site sewers are privately owned and maintained per the Joint Use Agreement of this commercial subdivision.
9. Site development to comply with all applicable conditions of approval for Z-0076-98, Z-0076-98(14), and all other subsequent site related actions.
10. The approval of all Public Works related improvements shown on this Tentative Map is in concept only. Specific design and construction details relating to size, type and/or alignment of public improvements, including but not limited to street, sewer and drainage improvements, shall be resolved prior to approval of the construction plans by the City. No deviations from adopted City Standards shall be allowed unless specific written approval for such is received from the City Engineer prior to the recordation of a Final Map or the approval of subdivision-related construction plans, whichever may occur first.

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☒

CONSENT

☐

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

TM-0002-02 - ELKHORN/GRAND CANYON - PERMA-BILT - Request for a Tentative Map for 45 Lots on 13.45 Gross Acres located adjacent to the northeast corner of Elkhorn Road and Grand Canyon Drive (APN's: 125-18-801-009, 010 and 011), U (Undeveloped) Zone [R (Rural Density Residential) and L (Low Density Residential) General Plan Designations] under Resolution of Intent to R-1 (Single Family Residential), Ward 6 (Mack)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to conditions.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

TRUESDELL - APPROVED, subject to staff's conditions and amending condition #8 as follows: The Final Map for this subdivision must show appropriate public street dedications in accordance with Standard Drawings #201.1 and #245.1 for dedicated right turn lanes and dual left turn lanes, and Standard Drawings #234.1, #2324.2 and #234.3 for bus turnouts *unless otherwise allowed in writing by the Traffic Engineer* - UNANIMOUS

This is final action.

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI stated this is a Consent item.

ANDREW REED, Planning & Development Department, pointed out that staff reviewed the proposed Tentative Map and found it to be in conformance with the conditions of approval of the rezoning and the recommendation is for approval.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 2 – TM-0002-02

MINUTES – Continued:

JEFFREY ARMSTRONG, VTN Nevada, 2727 South Rainbow Boulevard, stated that he requested the item be pulled off the Consent Agenda so that Public Works could clarify the bus turnouts requirement. He received a letter from the transportation department stating that that condition is no longer required. BART ANDERSON, Public Works Department, concurred and recommended that at the end of Condition #8 the following words be added: “unless otherwise allowed in writing by the Traffic Engineer”. MR. ARMSTRONG accepted the amendment.

There was no further discussion.

(6:14 - 6:16)

1-373

CONDITIONS:

Planning and Development

1. Approval of the Tentative Map shall be for no more than two (2) years. If a Final Map is not recorded on all or a portion of the area embraced by the Tentative Map within two (2) years of the approval of the Tentative Map, a new Tentative Map must be filed.
2. No Final Map Technical Review (FMTR) shall be submitted until a Tentative Map has been approved on the balance of the overall development.
3. All development shall conform to the Conditions of Approval for Rezoning (Z-0035-01), Special Use Permit (U-0064-01), Variance (V-0032-01), and all subsequent site related actions, as required by the City of Las Vegas Planning and Development, and Public Works Departments.
4. Street names must be provided in accord with the City’s Street Naming Regulations.
5. All development is subject to the conditions of City Departments and State Subdivision Statutes.
6. A fully operational fire protection system, including fire apparatus roads, fire hydrants and water supply, shall be installed and shall be functioning prior to construction of any combustible structures.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 2 – TM-0002-02

CONDITIONS – Continued:

Public Works

7. Submit a Petition of Vacation to Clark County for Solar Avenue between Tee Pee Lane and this site or dedicate and improve appropriate right-of-way to terminate Solar Avenue in a manner acceptable to Public Works. The Petition of Vacation shall be approved by the Clark County Commission, whichever appropriate prior to the submittal of a Final Map Technical Review for this development. The Order of Vacation shall record prior to the recordation of a Final Map adjacent to the Solar Avenue alignment.
8. The Final Map for this subdivision must show appropriate public street dedications in accordance with Standard Drawings #201.1 and #245.1 for dedicated right turn lanes and dual left turn lanes, and Standard Drawings #234.1, #234.2 and #234.3 for bus turnouts.
9. Site development to comply with all applicable conditions of approval for Z-0035-01, U-0064-01, V-0032-01 and all other subsequent site related actions.
10. The approval of all Public Works related improvements shown on this Tentative Map is in concept only. Specific design and construction details relating to size, type and/or alignment of public improvements, including but not limited to street, sewer and drainage improvements, shall be resolved prior to approval of the construction plans by the City. No deviations from adopted City Standards shall be allowed unless specific written approval for such is received from the City Engineer prior to the recordation of a Final Map or the approval of subdivision-related construction plans, whichever may occur first.

10. AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☒

CONSENT

☐

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

Z-0071-98(3) - GERALDINE HUGHES - Request for an Extension of Time of an approved Rezoning FROM: R-1 (Single Family Residential) TO: C-1 (Limited Commercial) of 1.74 Acres located adjacent to the south side of Vegas Drive, approximately 100 feet west of Pyramid Drive (APN: 139-30-501-003), Ward 5 (Weekly)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

0

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

0

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to conditions.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

QUINN - Motion to APPROVE Items 1, 3 and 4, subject to staff's conditions – Motion carried with TRUESELLE abstaining on Item 1 because he is currently working with Laurich Properties

To be heard by the City Council on 3/20/2002.

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI stated this is a Consent item.

There was no discussion.

(6:04 – 6:06)

1-318

CONDITIONS:

Planning and Development

1. The zoning shall expire on January 25, 2003, unless an Extension of Time has been granted.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 3 – Z-0071-98(3)

CONDITIONS - Continued:

2. Conformance to all applicable conditions of approval of Rezoning Z-0071-98, Special Use Permit U-0006-02, Variance V-0005-00 and Site Development Plan Review Z-0071-98(4).

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☒

CONSENT

☐

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

A-0001-02(A) - CRAIG MARKETPLACE, LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY - Petition to Annex property generally located on the west side of U.S. 95, 660 feet south of Craig Road, APN: 138-03-701-011 and 012, containing approximately 1.34 acres of land, Ward 6 (Mack)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

0

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

0

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application - Not Applicable
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

QUINN - Motion to APPROVE Items 1, 3 and 4, subject to staff's conditions – Motion carried with TRUESELLE abstaining on Item 1 because he is currently working with Laurich Properties

This item will be forwarded to City Council in ordinance form.

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI stated this is a Consent item.

There was no discussion.

(6:04 – 6:06)

1-318

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING - ABEYANCE - GPA-0045-00 - LAS VEGAS MASONIC TEMPLE ASSOCIATION - Request to Amend a portion of the southeast sector of the General Plan FROM: L (Low density Residential) TO: SC (Service Commercial) on approximately 3.0 Acres located at 2200 West Mesquite Avenue (APN: 139-29-801-005), Ward 5 (Weekly)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

0

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

0

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends DENIAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application – Not Applicable
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

TRUEDELL – ABEYANCE to 2/28/2002 – UNANIMOUS with QUINN abstaining because this organization financially supported his son and he will not be able to vote objectively on this item

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing open.

ANDREW REED, Planning & Development Department, requested that the item be held in abeyance.

GARY GRAY, appeared on behalf of the applicant, Ad America and concurred with staff's abeyance request.

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing closed.

(6:06 - 6:07)

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING - ABEYANCE - V-0058-01 - OWENS STAR, LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY - Request for a Variance TO ALLOW A PROPOSED RETAIL BUILDING TO BE CONSTRUCTED 20 FEET FROM THE REAR PROPERTY LINE WHERE THE RESIDENTIAL ADJACENCY STANDARDS REQUIRE A MINIMUM SETBACK OF 54 FEET located adjacent to the southwest corner of Owens Avenue and Sandhill Road (APN: 140-30-102-006), R-1 (Single Family Residential) Zone under Resolution of Intent to N-S (Neighborhood Service), Ward 3 (Reese)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

0

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

0

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends DENIAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

TRUESDELL – ABEYANCE TO 3/14/2002 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING - UNANIMOUS

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing open.

ANDREW REED, Planning and Development Department, explained that the applicant is intending to apply for another Variance and will be submitting a revised site plan to be heard on 3/14/2002. He asked that Item 6 [V-0058-01] and Item 7 [Z-0057-01(1)] be held in abeyance so that they can be heard at the same time.

SUSAN JOHNSTON, BC Garcia, appeared on behalf of the applicant and concurred with the abeyance request.

No one appeared in opposition.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 6 – V-0058-01

MINUTES – Continued:

There was no further discussion.

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing closed.

NOTE: All discussion pertaining to Item 6 [V-0058-01] and Item 7 [Z-0057-01(1)] was held under Item 6 [V-0058-01].

(6:05 - 6:06)

1-97

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING - ABEYANCE - Z-0057-01(1) - OWENS STAR, LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY - Request for a Site Development Plan Review and a Reduction in the amount of Required Perimeter Landscaping FOR A PROPOSED 27,400 SQUARE FOOT COMMERCIAL CENTER on 3.13 Acres adjacent to the southwest corner of Owens Avenue and Sandhill Road (APN: 140-30-102-006), R-1 (Single Family Residential) Zone under Resolution of Intent to N-S (Neighborhood Service), Ward 3 (Reese)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends DENIAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

TRUESDELL – ABEYANCE TO 3/14/2002 - UNANIMOUS

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing open.

SUSAN JOHNSTON, BC Garcia, appeared on behalf of the applicant and concurred with the abeyance request.

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing closed.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 7 – Z-0057-01(1)

MINUTES – Continued:

NOTE: All discussion pertaining to Item 6 [V-0058-01] and Item 7 [Z-0057-01(1)] was held under Item 6 [V-0058-01].

(6:05 - 6:06)

1-97

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING - ABEYANCE - U-0159-01 - FORT LEWIS DEVELOPMENT ON BEHALF OF JAMES C. SMITH - Request for a Special Use Permit FOR A PROPOSED USED MOTOR VEHICLE DEALERSHIP located adjacent to the northeast corner of Cheyenne Avenue and JoAnn Way (APN: 138-12-801-016), C-2 (General Commercial) Zone, Ward 6 (Mack)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends DENIAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

TRUEDELL - DENIED - UNANIMOUS

Final Action

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing open.

ANDREW REED, Planning and Development Department, indicated that the applicant sent a fax requesting that Item 8 [U-0159-01] and Item 9 [SD-0079-01] be held in abeyance for 30 days. However, staff is unable to support the use permit and an abeyance will not change staff's position. Therefore, he requested that both items move forward.

The applicant was not present. MR. REED discussed with CHAIRMAN GALATI that there was not enough time to inform the applicant that even though a request for the abeyance was received, the Board would decide whether to grant the abeyance.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 8 – U-0159-01

MINUTES – Continued:

DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY BRYAN SCOTT advised CHAIRMAN GALATI that the Board could hear the item and take appropriate action at that time or they could abey the item. CHAIRMAN GALATI opted to hear the items as they appear on the agenda, and if the applicant was not yet present the Board would decide the course of action at that time.

TROY JESCHKE, Planning & Development Department, reiterated that the applicant requested that both items be held in abeyance. Even though the applicant was not present, VICE-CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL stated that he would prefer hearing both items.

MR. JESCHKE indicated that the property is zoned C-2 (General Commercial) with characteristics that commonly include outdoor storage and display. However, staff finds that a used car dealership at this location is not appropriate because it will not be compatible with the residential uses to the west. No other businesses along this portion of Cheyenne Avenue or nearby portions of Rancho Drive have outdoor storage or products of any kind on their property. In addition, in the past staff has only entertained applications for motor vehicle dealerships directly on Rancho Drive. This site does not have any frontage on Rancho Drive, which would set a precedent for future used motor vehicle sales along Cheyenne Avenue. Therefore, staff recommended denial.

Regarding Item 9 [SD-0079-01], MR. JESCHKE stated that access to the site is from one driveway onto Cheyenne Avenue. The proposed building is situated towards the center of the site with parking to the southeast and west. A vehicle storage area is depicted to the north of the building. The submitted landscape plan indicates several rows of parking spaces with no landscaping islands at the ends of the rows. In view of the excess parking available on the site, additional landscape fingers could be implemented without detriment to the site. Staff finds the submitted elevations depict a plain-looking box-like building with no architectural expression or façade articulation. Therefore, staff recommends denial.

TODD FARLOW, 240 North 19th Street, concurred with staff's recommendation of denial, especially due to the lack of sufficient landscaping.

LOUISE RUSKAMP, 8500 Log Cabin Way, agreed with staff's report regarding the project's incompatibility with the residential uses in the area, and with staff's recommendation for denial. The City is working very hard to make commercial or business projects compatible. These types of uses tend to have very bright lights, which would impact the residential neighborhood. Addressing Condition #5, MS. RUSKAMP asked if the service bays would remain closed during business hours, and which side of the building the service bays are located. MR. JESCHKE replied that they are located on the north and east side of the building.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 8 – U-0159-01

MINUTES – Continued:

Since the applicant was not present, COMMISSIONER McSWAIN asked about the procedure for notifying the applicant that both items were denied. ROBERT GENZER, Director, Planning & Development Department, replied that Planning staff would call the applicant and notify them of the appeal process.

There was no further discussion.

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing closed.

NOTE: All discussion pertaining to Item 8 [U-0159-01] and Item 9 [SD-0079-01] were held under Item 8 [U-0159-01].

(6:07 - 6:10/6:43 - 6:52)

1-163/1-1396

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING - ABEYANCE - SD-0079-01 - FORT LEWIS DEVELOPMENT ON BEHALF OF JAMES C. SMITH - Request for a Site Development Plan Review and a Reduction in the Amount of Required Parking Lot Landscaping FOR A PROPOSED 4,050 SQUARE-FOOT USED MOTOR VEHICLE DEALERSHIP on 1.36 Acres, located adjacent to the northeast corner of Cheyenne Avenue and JoAnn Way (APN: 138-12-801-016), C-2 (General Commercial) Zone, Ward 6 (Mack)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

2

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

0

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends DENIAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

TRUESDELL - DENIED - UNANIMOUS

Final Action

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing open.

There was no discussion.

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing closed.

NOTE: All discussion pertaining to Item 8 [U-0159-01] and Item 9 [SD-0079-01] were held under Item 8 [U-0159-01].

(6:07 - 6:10/6:43 - 6:52)

1-163/1-1396

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING - ABEYANCE - RENOTIFICATION - VAC-0045-01 - OVID A. AND EDNA E. MOORE - Petition to vacate Versi Mount Road generally located between Grand Teton Drive and Ackerman Avenue, Ward 6 (Mack)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends DENIAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

TRUESDELL – ABEYANCE to 2/28/2002 - UNANIMOUS

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing open.

ANDREW REED, Planning & Development Department, stated that the required Public Hearing Notice was not published in the newspaper. Therefore, he requested that the item be held in abeyance.

JEFFREY ARMSTRONG, VTN Nevada, 2727 South Rainbow Boulevard, concurred with staff's request.

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing closed.

(6:10 - 6:11)

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT**DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER**☐**CONSENT**☒**DISCUSSION****SUBJECT:**

PUBLIC HEARING - Z-0020-97(33) - CITY OF LAS VEGAS - Request for a Major Modification to the Las Vegas Medical District Neighborhood Plan to update and revise the Plan document, as part of the City's General Plan for the area bounded by Alta Drive to the north, Charleston Boulevard to the south, Martin L. King Boulevard to the east and Rancho Drive to the west, PD (Planned Development) Zone, Ward 5 (Weekly)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:**Planning Commission Mtg.****City Council Meeting****APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:****Planning Commission Mtg.****City Council Meeting****RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to conditions.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

McSWAIN – ABEYANCE to 4/11/2002 - UNANIMOUS

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing open.

SEAN ROBERTSON, Planning & Development, explained that this document is a revision to the Las Vegas Medical District Neighborhood Plan that was originally adopted in 1997. Its intent is to address issues that have arisen since that time regarding permitted land uses, development standards, as well as the overall organization of the plan. This revision is based largely on feedback that was received from neighborhood meetings that were held in May and November of 2001 and several individual meetings with property owners and their representatives. Staff believes that it addresses relevant issues and concerns in a manner that provides for the flexibility of development while maintaining the intent of the original plan, which is pedestrian friendly and high quality development. Staff recommended approval, with a change to the sign standard, which would be to call out "Hospital ID and Directional Sign" as an individual sign and that they be allowed to be internally illuminated.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 11 – Z-0020-97(33)

MINUTES – Continued:

BILL WOOD, Director of Real Estate, University of Nevada Las Vegas, 4505 Maryland Parkway, indicated that a portion of that district was purchased by the University and Community College system of Nevada in December. The approximate 18-acre property is located at the corner of Charleston Boulevard and Shadow Lane. He will continue to work with staff as part of the overall planning effort.

EDITH WILLIAMSON owns property at 501 Shadow Lane. She stated that parking is still a problem at this location and the area is not pedestrian friendly. The widening of Alta Drive has added to the impact, as well as the widening of the existing sidewalks. In fact, past her property a seven-foot sidewalk was put in tearing down part of her fence. She expressed concern about the buses that park in her driveway for hours and believes that moving the bus stop about 40 feet further down would correct this problem. This is a danger for her tenants, who have difficulty getting out of the driveway. She informed the Mayor and RTC (Regional Transportation Commission) about this situation, but no one returned her calls. MR. ROBERTSON explained that the parking requirements would have adhere to Title 19A, which are stricter than the existing plan. In addition, staff would be more stringent on allowing parking variances on smaller properties. As far as the bus stop, that is where it was located by the RTC.

MS. WILLIAMSON noted that the County purchased most of that property and is not doing their due diligence. CHAIRMAN GALATI disagreed. The County does make the City Planning Commission and City Council aware of projects planned in the County.

WALTER PETRONI, 2001 Pinto Lane, thanked MR. ROBERTSON for holding meetings for the area residents. He stated that most surrounding properties have five-foot sidewalks and asked why the sidewalks are being widened to six feet. Two years ago properties north of Tonopah did not have sidewalks, but were put in to comply with ADA (American with Disabilities Act) requirements. MR. PETRONI indicated that his neighbor to the west also opposes the six-foot sidewalk and that they should be kept at five feet. As far as making the area pedestrian friendly, the only people that walk in this area are hospital and medical office employees.

MR. WOOD clarified that the intended use for the 18-acre property; 1700 West Charleston, 1001 Shadow Lane and 833 Shadow Lane, is for the school of dentistry and bio-technology programs.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 11 – Z-0020-97(33)

MINUTES – Continued:

CHAIRMAN GALATI verified with MR. ROBERTSON that the sidewalks would be put in as the property is redeveloped or new project is developed. The requirement has always been a 10-foot sidewalk, but many areas in this particular location do not have a lot of room. Therefore, the property owner is given the option of a six-foot sidewalk with landscaping.

In response to COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY's query about whether schools are permitted uses in the MD-1 area, MR. ROBERTSON replied that if they do not come under the medical labs, staff may work with the applicant for a text amendment to have it be permitted. COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY pointed out that cellular communication facilities are prohibited, but feels that they should not necessarily be prohibited in this commercial area, especially if they could be stealth. He also mentioned that some flexibility should be considered as to what can be built at this location. There should be a clear definition of major medical because these are intense uses and should be as centralized as possible or close to Charleston Boulevard.

COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY further pointed out that the south side of Charleston Boulevard is not incorporated on this plan, yet that is really part of the area and thoughts should be given to what should go in there that ties into the medical district. ROBERT GENZER, Director, Planning & Development Department, answered that the south side of Charleston Boulevard is part of the Rancho Drive/Charleston Boulevard study area that will be coming before the Planning Commission in March. COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY concluded that the plan is a good idea and commended staff for working with the neighbors regarding this issue.

COMMISSIONER McSWAIN questioned why a stand-alone facility for dining would not be allowed. She understands not wanting the fast food because of the drive thru traffic, yet staff indicates in the report the open space area and about providing vending and dining. She commented that maybe too much open space is being created and neglecting the critical parking issue. MR. ROBERTSON commented that regarding the eating establishments, staff is trying to make this plan more flexible than the existing plan. This might call for additional work. Staff is trying to allow those as ancillary uses for a larger hospital or office building. As far as open space, it is required for developments of 10,000 square feet or more. COMMISSIONER McSWAIN stated that she can see the benefit of that, but the parking is a bigger issue considering what already exists. MR. ROBERTSON reiterated that staff requires more parking than the original plan per Title 19, and that additional discussion is required to address the parking issue at this location.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 11 – Z-0020-97(33)

MINUTES – Continued:

COMMISSIONER QUINN stated that he would not support anything in this district until the parking issue is resolved. He received numerous parking tickets while visiting the hospital. Many of the lots are reserved for employee parking and no parking is available on the street. In case of an emergency a person should be able to park quickly and without the worry of parking tickets.

COMMISSIONER EVANS mentioned that in 1972, he attended a Board of Zoning Adjustment meeting for a Variance to allow a run away house on Goldring. At that time, the area was entirely residential with a real rural atmosphere. He understands that times change and evolve, but long time residents are being impacted. He would like to see an agreement reached regarding the sidewalks. This would be a great opportunity to provide developments such as respite care, condominium living or a residential facility for people convalescing after surgery who need to live near a medical facility. Finally, the parking issue needs to be addressed.

VICE-CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL commented that his residence, as well as his office was located within the medical district for many years. This location definitely has opportunities for medical with some retail support. Banks and restaurants should be allowed where many people work. In fact, some of the existing restaurants have seating for only 75 people and cannot accommodate the amount of lunch traffic that is found in this location. The university is going to bring more students there through the dental college. The debate should not be whether a sidewalk is five or six feet, but instead how to plan this medical district with the hospital, services, density and the proximity to downtown. One of the biggest recruiting problems of the hospitals is affordable housing for nursing and this plan does not encourage housing. He requested that the item be held in abeyance for the opportunity to include some additional uses within this area that are typically found within the Town Center zoning category. COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY concurred with VICE-CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL's comments and for the abeyance request. He would be happy to participate in any discussions regarding this issue before it comes back to the Planning Commission.

MR. GENZER suggested that a 60-day abeyance would be appropriate. Staff will consider all the comments made by the Board to somewhat change the direction of the plan.

There was no further discussion.

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing closed.

(6:52 - 7:19)

1-1732

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING - Z-0033-97(28) - PERMA-BILT HOMES - Request for a Major Modification to the Lone Mountain Master Plan, TO AMEND FIGURE 9 REGARDING MULTIPURPOSE PATHWAYS AND TO REMOVE CERTAIN PATHWAY/TRAIL DESIGNATIONS generally located north of Cheyenne Avenue, between Jensen Street and the Western Beltway, Ward 4 (Brown)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to conditions.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

McSWAIN- APPROVED subject to staff's conditions - UNANIMOUS

To be heard by the City Council on 3/20/2002

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing open.

TROY JESCHKE, Planning & Development Department, stated that the applicant is proposing to amend the Lone Mountain Master Plan to eliminate portions of trail alignments. These trails are along Gowan Road, to the west of Shady Timber Street, along Gowan Road, between Shadow Peak Street and Hualapai Way, the western beltway between Gowan Road and the Gilmore Channel alignment and down the Spring Shadow Road between Cheyenne Avenue and Gilmore Channel alignment. Staff finds the applicant's justification for the elimination of the trail alignments is based on the assertion that all of the adjacent developments were approved without leaving the necessary space for trails. Staff notes that the trails being eliminated are interior to the Lone Mountain development and will not directly affect the overall multi-use trails plan. Therefore, staff recommended approval. This item was noticed in the newspaper only.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 12 – Z-0033-97(28)

MINUTES – Continued:

PAUL KENNER, 4435 South Jones, stated that the Site Development Plan Review and final maps were approved. He indicated that at the final stages of this project staff noted that five years ago a map was approved for the Lone Mountain Plan that showed the proposed alignment of streets, flood control channels, and roadways. In the process several things have changed. Gowan Road, which initially was shown to go all the way through, has been changed and does not tie into the Beltway. The Gilmore Channel, for drainage purposes, has been identified. There is no capability of crossing the Beltway on Gowan Road or the capability of following the Beltway to the Gilmore Channel. Therefore, he feels that the concern is to adjust the plan so that it identifies what actually is being built. MR. KENNER concurred with staff's recommendations.

TODD FARLOW, 240 North 19th Street, indicated that the trails system was only addressed on 1/16/2002 City Council and already the applicant is asking they be amended. If these trails are eliminated from this location, he wants them to be placed somewhere else. No reduction should be given to the total of trail miles.

ROBERT GENZER, Director, Planning & Development Department, clarified that the trails in question are not on the plans that MR. FARLOW referred to. These were trails that were identified only on the Lone Mountain West Master Plan. CHAIRMAN GALATI added this does not change any of the master trail plans, and that the trails are internal.

There was no further discussion.

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing closed.

(7:19 - 7:25)

1-2976

CONDITIONS:

Planning and Development

1. The applicant shall submit and have approved an amendment of Map #8 of the Master Plan Transportation Trails Element.
2. Figure # 9 of the Lone Mountain Master Plan shall be amended to reflect the elimination of the trails designations as follows:
 - Spring Shadow Road (from Cheyenne Avenue to the Gilmore Channel),
 - Gowan Road (from Shadow Peak Street to Hualapai Way),
 - Gowan Road (from Shady Timber Street to the Western Beltway), and
 - The Western Beltway (from Gowan Road to the Gilmore Channel alignment).

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING - Z-0003-02 - REBEL OIL COMPANY - Request for a Rezoning FROM: R-3 (Medium Density Residential) TO: C-1 (Limited Commercial) of 0.05 Acres adjacent to the southwest corner of Washington Avenue and Decatur Boulevard (APN: 138-25-713-226), Ward 1 (M. McDonald)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to conditions.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

TRUEDELL - APPROVED subject to staff's conditions – UNANIMOUS with McSWAIN abstaining because Rebel Oil is one of her company's vendor

To be heard by the City Council on 3/20/2002

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing open.

ANDREW REED, Planning & Development Department, presented a report for Item 13 [Z-0003-02]. The subject site is currently designated as Service Commercial on the southwest sector map of the General Plan. Staff finds the request to C-1 Limited Commercial Zoning will be consistent with that General Plan designation and recommended approval.

Regarding Item 14 [V-0001-02], MR. REED indicated that the setback Variance is to allow the convenience store to have reduced setbacks along the south and west property lines. The convenience store will be 12.5 feet from the rear west property line where 20 feet is the

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 13 – Z-0003-02

MINUTES – Continued:

minimum setback required and 10 feet from the side or south property line where 10 feet is the minimum required. No landscaping is shown in the areas between the convenience store and the west and south property lines, which will be secured with a fence. Because of the narrowness of the subject site, staff finds there is a hardship and recommended approval of this request.

Item 15 [U-0002-02] is the related Special Use Permit for the off-premise sale of beer and wine. The City of Las Vegas zoning code requires the sale of beer and wine to be a minimum of 400 feet from a church, synagogue, school or child care facility licensed for more than 12 children or City park as measured from property line to property line. In this case, no protective use is known to be within the minimum separation distance. Staff finds the proposed use can be operated in a manner that is compatible with the development of the area and recommended approval of this request.

Item 16 [U-0003-02] is the Special Use Permit for the gasoline sales in conjunction with a convenience store. Staff finds the proposed use will be located on the site, which is adjacent to a major intersection and suitable for the intensity of land use. Staff recommended approval.

The Site Development Plan Review, Item 17 [SD-0003-02], is the review for the overall project. MR. REED explained that the applicant proposes to construct a convenience store in the southwest corner of the site. Gasoline sales area is depicted north of the store. Two 40-foot driveways provide access to the site from Decatur Boulevard and Washington Avenue. The existing block wall is six feet in height and is located along the west property line. The trash enclosure and self-service area water machine are shown along the west property line 40 feet from residential properties. An eight-foot wide landscape planter is shown along the east property line with plants that vary in width from five to eight feet and depicted along the north 180 feet of the west property line. No landscaping is shown in the 12.5-foot wide area between the convenience store and the balance of the west property line. This area is to be secured with a fence. An enhanced landscape area is depicted adjacent to the intersection of Washington Avenue and Decatur Boulevard.

The elevations for the convenience store depict a stucco exterior with decorative columns along the front of the building. The gasoline sales store canopy will have a flat roof and support columns that match those shown on the store. Staff finds that the Site Plan indicates the convenience store will be 10 feet from the south property line and 12 feet 6 inches from the west property line. Due to security concerns, the applicant proposes that the area immediately to the

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 13 – Z-0003-02

MINUTES – Continued:

convenience store should not be landscaped and should be secured with a fence. In regard to the south property line, staff finds this concern to be justified and supports the deletion of landscaping in this area, provided that the fence does secure the area as the applicant has proposed. However, in regard to the west property line, staff believes that it would enhance the compatibility of this proposal with the residential development to the west if the 12.5 foot path width between the structure and the west property line were landscaped and the existing block wall removed from that portion of the site. In order to aesthetically enhance the site, staff recommends that the remainder of the block wall along the west property line also be removed. However, to shield nearby residences from vehicle headlights, staff recommends the placement of a six-foot high decorative block wall on the back of those planters along the west side of the property line immediately adjacent to the sidewalks.

Staff notes that both the trash enclosures, and the air/water machine are located in the west portion of the site 40 feet from residentially-zoned property. In order to minimize impact to those residential buildings, staff is recommending that the trash enclosures, and the air/water machine be relocated. In regards to the landscaping plan, the urban design guidelines require the placement of a minimum of 15-foot wide landscape planters along Decatur Boulevard, Washington Avenue and Yale Street. The guidelines also require the placement of trees within the parking lots at a ratio of one tree for every six spaces. The guidelines state that the landscape requirement should only be waived when there is a unique or unusual hardship. Because of the small size of the property, staff finds full compliance would constitute a hardship. However, staff recommends 24-inch box trees spaced 20 feet on center be placed within the planters along the west property line in order to buffer the residential development to the west.

In regards to the applicant's request to not landscape those areas immediately to the west and south of the convenience store, staff concurs with the applicant's assertion regarding the area to the south. However, staff believes landscaping should be provided along the entire west property line in order to enhance the compatibility of this proposal with the nearby residential development. Staff recommended approval. MR. REED recommended that Condition #11 of Item 17 [SD-0003-02] be modified to relocate the trash enclosure and the air/water machine at least 50 feet from the residential property.

DANIEL LOERA, 5525 South Polaris, Suite B, appeared on behalf of the applicant. Regarding Item 17 [SD-0003-02], MR. LOERA indicated that originally they proposed to continue the fence all the way to the property line and wrap around the building. In particular they were concerned about noise, maintenance, and safety, not only for customers, but also for Rebel Oil employees.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 13 – Z-0003-02

MINUTES – Continued:

It creates a pocket for mischief, which has been experienced by other Rebel Oil facilities. The applicant is willing to consider reducing the block wall all the way back to the trash enclosure area and pick up from that point and continue down. That would mitigate staff's concern regarding the headlights into adjacent residences, but at the same time address the safety and maintenance issue along the southwest corner. Numerous chain link fences have been put around this property to prevent dumping and preventing the lot from being used as a short cut. Additionally, if the lot is going to be used as a thruway and the area is landscaped, it will be difficult to maintain that landscaping.

MR. LOERA concurred with staff's recommendations and conditions with the exception of two, which he outlined. In regards to Item 17 [SD-0003-02], Condition #11, by putting the trash enclosure on the east side of the property, due to the narrowness of this lot, the drive aisles would be quite narrow and would considerably congest the flow of traffic on that side. MR. LOERA suggested that the trash enclosure be left at its present location, but shifted flush to the curb where the water dispenser is located. He would be willing to continue the landscaping behind it. That would put it outside of the guidelines 50 feet away from residential properties.

MR. LOERA asked for clarification on the intent of Condition #3 relating to Item 15 [U-0002-02]. ROBERT GENZER, Director, Planning & Development Department, clarified that that condition is imposed on every convenience store in the City of Las Vegas. MR. LOERA disputed the condition as being unfair. Rebel Convenience Stores and Rebel Oil have been in the Las Vegas Valley for many years and have had quality sales and stores. As the codes have changed, they continued to meet or exceed the codes to provide a clean, well-lit, friendly environment for their customers. Their records, with respect to any sort of incidents with under age sales is as good as any other retailer. A great amount of everyday working class people utilize these kind of products; people like to have the option of buying a six pack, a twelve-pack or a single container. The 7-Eleven store on Washington Avenue and the AM/PM Mini Mart on Decatur Boulevard are not subject to this kind of requirement. As a retailer, he wants the same opportunity but not being able to offer the same items, puts him at a disadvantage.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 13 – Z-0003-02

MINUTES – Continued:

TODD FARLOW, 240 North 19th Street, disagreed with the applicant's request for the single container. He also asked that a condition be included that Rebel Oil, along with the rest of the retail gasoline stores be made to post a clean-up bond. The proposed business is too intense for the property. The applicant should adhere to the landscaping standards and no reductions should be granted.

CRAIG MOORE, 4427 Via Torino, stated that he is a big fan of Shapiro Beer and it comes in a tall 16-ounce, eight-sided container. He often stops to buy two cans to take home, as they are not sold in six packs.

KAREN LEWIS, 4821 West Washington, appeared in opposition of Items 13 through 17 because requirements cannot be met on a sub-standard sized lot. Not only will they fall short on their minimum of 20 feet as required but they will be unable to provide adequate parking spaces and will not have room for the required landscaping. The intersection at Decatur Boulevard and Washington Avenue is already congested. The proposed 3,758 square-foot store built on a small lot would make this a potentially dangerous area for traffic and pedestrian accidents. She is concerned about access on Yale Street, which would cause a traffic problem on this street. An eight-foot block wall along Yale Street, from Washington Avenue to Vermont Avenue would provide some privacy. This lot should be developed in compliance with the code with a minimum setback of 20 feet and no access to Yale Street.

MRS. HUSBAND, 4921 West Washington Avenue, stated that both vehicular and pedestrian traffic are very heavy at the intersection of Decatur Boulevard and Washington Avenue. People are already having a hard time trying to get in and out of the 7-Eleven store, and it creates a dangerous situation for people who need to make left-hand turns or are trying to get out of their driveways. It would be unfair to put this business on such a small lot. She discussed with CHAIRMAN GALATI that there should be an entrance on Decatur Boulevard and one on Washington Avenue with no access to Yale Street.

AL GALLEGGO, citizen of Las Vegas, pointed out that if the applicant is allowed to bring the trash enclosure forward it would make for a bathroom behind the trees. It should be moved as far back as possible. MR. GALLEGGO recalled that about a year ago, a Mexican restaurant located kitty corner to this property was denied a liquor license by the City Council because Rebel Oil had already asked for a liquor license. Rebel Oil should not be granted a liquor license automatically, but should go through the liquor license application process.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 13 – Z-0003-02

MINUTES – Continued:

DOROTHY ORR, Minnesota Street, stated that at the corner of Nebraska Avenue and Decatur Boulevard there was a gas station that experienced leakage. She concurred with MRS. HUSBAND regarding the traffic at the intersection of Decatur Boulevard and Washington, making it a dangerous situation for kids who attend the junior high school and the Western High School. There already are the 7-Eleven and Arco stores and another convenience store is not needed.

VICE-CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL asked if this project will have a cross access with the existing Winchells located to the south. MR. LOERA replied that the applicant is currently in negotiations, but no agreements have been reached at this time. VICE-CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL stated that a cross access would be a solution to the traffic problem. He encouraged the applicant to close the trash enclosure. This is a difficult corner, but there should be landscaping along the west side of the building.

COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY commented that Rebel Oil is one of the best looking convenience stores in the Valley, but there are already many convenience stores in this area and he would like to see something different at this location.

COMMISSIONER QUINN asked whether the applicant would be willing to install an attractive wrought iron or steel fence with landscaping in lieu of the block wall. This will be a win-win situation. MR. LOERA replied that he would prefer revising the condition subject to working with staff. JOHN KOSWAN, Planning Supervisor, Planning & Development Department, commented that putting a block wall behind this building creates an area that will obscure any kind of mischief that might occur. A wrought iron fence behind the building will be visible from Yale Street and Metro would be able to see any kind of adverse activity. However, staff still requires a solid wall to block the headlights along the parking area on Yale Street. COMMISSIONER QUINN stated that the issue could be resolved with three-foot berming. MR. KOSWAN replied that the strip might be too narrow for an adequate berm. COMMISSIONER QUINN further suggested that the berm could be put in the parking area. Landscaping and the construction of wrought iron fencing behind the building would be appropriate. MR. KOSWAN indicated that that might be an option.

CHAIRMAN GALATI suggested landscaping that entire area and then continuing the wall around the parking area so that the wall would be adjacent to the parking and the landscaping would face toward the residential area to create a buffer. He also added that this corner is saturated with convenience stores, enough to address the needs of this neighborhood. COMMISSIONER EVANS commented that the property is being over utilized.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 13 – Z-0003-02

MINUTES – Continued:

COMMISSIONER GOYNES agreed that Washington Avenue is at peak traffic almost 24 hours a day. The proposed project is too intense. As far as the single container, it is an issue because of the schools in this neighborhood.

CHAIRMAN GALATI pointed out that regardless of what will be done with the use, this small piece of R-3 in the middle of C-1 should be cleaned and developed.

There was no further discussion.

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing closed.

NOTE: All discussion pertaining to Item 13 [Z-0003-02], Item 14 [V-0001-02], Item 15 [U-0002-02], Item 16 [U-0003-02], and Item 17 [SD-0003-02] were held under Item 13 [Z-0003-02].

(7:25 - 8:08)

1-3261/2-1

CONDITIONS:

Planning and Development

1. A Resolution of Intent with a two-year time limit.
2. A Site Development Plan Review application shall be approved by the Planning Commission or City Council prior to issuance of any permits, any site grading, and all development activity for the site.

Public Works

3. Construct all incomplete half-street improvements (sidewalk) on Yale Street adjacent to this site concurrent with development of this site.
4. Remove all substandard public street improvements and unused driveway cuts adjacent to this site, if any, and replace with new improvements meeting current City Standards concurrent with development of this site.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 13 – Z-0003-02

CONDITIONS– Continued:

5. An update to the previously approved Traffic Impact Analysis must be submitted to and approved by the Department of Public Works prior to the issuance of any building or grading permits or submittal of any construction drawings, whichever may occur first. Comply with the recommendations of the approved Traffic Impact Analysis prior to occupancy of the site. The City shall determine area traffic mitigation contribution requirements based upon information provided in the approved Traffic Impact Analysis; such monies shall be contributed prior to the issuance of any permits for this site. The Traffic Impact Analysis shall also include a section addressing Standard Drawings #234.1 #234.2 and #234.3 to determine additional right-of-way requirements for bus turnouts adjacent to this site, if any; dedicate all areas recommended by the approved Traffic Impact Analysis. No recommendation of the approved Traffic Impact Analysis, nor compliance therewith, shall be deemed to modify or eliminate any condition of approval imposed by the Planning Commission or the City Council on the development of this site.
6. Landscape and maintain all unimproved rights-of-way on Decatur Boulevard adjacent to this site.
7. Submit an encroachment agreement for all landscaping and private improvements in the Decatur Boulevard public rights-of-way adjacent to this site prior to the issuance of any permits.

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING - V-0001-02 - REBEL OIL COMPANY - Request for a Variance TO ALLOW A PROPOSED CONVENIENCE STORE TO BE 12 FEET 6 INCHES FROM THE REAR PROPERTY LINE WHERE 20 FEET IS THE MINIMUM SETBACK REQUIRED on 0.86 Acres adjacent to the southwest corner of Washington Avenue and Decatur Boulevard (APN's: 138-25-713-225 through 227), R-3 (Medium Density Residential) and C-1 (Limited Commercial) Zones, [PROPOSED: C-1 (Limited Commercial)] Ward 1 (M. McDonald)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL subject to conditions.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

BUCKLEY – DENIED – Motion carried with QUINN and TRUESDELL voting NO and McSWAIN abstaining because Rebel Oil is one of her company's vendors

To be heard by the City Council on 3/20/2002

NOTE: An initial motion by TRUESDELL for approval failed with GALATI, BUCKLEY, GOYNES and EVANS voting NO and McSWAIN abstaining because Rebel Oil is one of her company's vendor.

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing open.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 14 – V-0001-02

MINUTES – Continued:

VICE-CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL moved to approve the item with an additional condition that the applicant meet with staff to discuss removing the wall, to landscape up to the building line and to create and incorporate the newer design standards with regards to screening and landscaping to create a better Variance. CHRIS GLORE, Planning & Development Department, indicated that that condition would be more appropriate to impose upon Item 17 [SD-0003-02].

COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY stated that there is more room on the empty site along Vegas Drive for this kind of project, and a Variance is not required.

CHAIRMAN GALATI stressed that this application is only for the building placement to go from 20 feet to 12.6 feet.

There was no further discussion.

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing closed.

NOTE: See Item 13 [Z-0003-02], Item 14 [V-0001-02], Item 15 [U-0002-02], Item 16 [U-0003-02] and Item 17 [SD-0003-02] for other related discussion.

(7:25 - 8:08)

1-3261/2-1

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING - U-0002-02 - REBEL OIL COMPANY - Request for a Special Use Permit FOR THE SALE OF BEER AND WINE FOR OFF-PREMISE CONSUMPTION IN CONJUNCTION WITH A PROPOSED CONVENIENCE STORE on 0.86 Acres adjacent to the southwest corner of Washington Avenue and Decatur Boulevard (APN's: 138-25-713-225 through 227), R-3 (Medium Density Residential) and C-1 (Limited Commercial) Zones, [PROPOSED: C-1 (Limited Commercial)], Ward 1 (M. McDonald)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to conditions.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

BUCKLEY - DENIED – Motion carried with QUINN and TRUESDELL voting NO and McSWAIN abstaining because Rebel Oil is one of her company's vendors

Final Action

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing open.

There was no discussion.

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing closed.

NOTE: See Item 13 [Z-0003-02], Item 14 [V-0001-02], Item 15 [U-0002-02], Item 16 [U-0003-02] and Item 17 [SD-0003-02] for other related discussion.

(7:25 - 8:08)

1-3261/2-1

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING - U-0003-02 - REBEL OIL COMPANY - Request for a Special Use Permit FOR THE SALE OF GASOLINE IN CONJUNCTION WITH A PROPOSED CONVENIENCE STORE on 0.86 Acres adjacent to the southwest corner of Washington Avenue and Decatur Boulevard (APN's: 138-25-713-225 through 227), R-3 (Medium Density Residential) and C-1 (Limited Commercial) Zones, [PROPOSED: C -1 (Limited Commercial)], Ward 1 (M. McDonald)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to conditions.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

BUCKLEY – DENIED - Motion carried with QUINN and TRUESDELL voting NO and McSWAIN abstaining because Rebel Oil is one of her company's vendor

Final Action

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing open.

There was no further discussion.

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing closed.

NOTE: See Item 13 [Z-0003-02], Item 14 [V-0001-02], Item 15 [U-0002-02], Item 16 [U-0003-02] and Item 17 [SD-0003-02] for other related discussion.

(7:25 - 8:08)

1-3261/2-1

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: **ROBERT S. GENZER** ☐ **CONSENT** ☒ **DISCUSSION**

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING - SD-0003-02 - REBEL OIL COMPANY - Request for a Site Development Plan Review and a reduction in the amount of required perimeter and parking lot landscaping FOR A PROPOSED 3,758 SQUARE FOOT CONVENIENCE STORE WITH GASOLINE SALES on 0.86 Acres adjacent to the southwest corner of Washington Avenue and Decatur Boulevard (APN's: 138-25-713-225 through 227) R-3 (Medium Density Residential) and C-1 (Limited Commercial) Zones [PROPOSED: C-1 (Limited Commercial)], Ward 1 (M. McDonald)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to conditions.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

BUCKLEY – DENIED - Motion carried with QUINN and TRUESELLE voting NO and McSWAIN abstaining because Rebel Oil is one of her company's vendors

To be heard by the City Council on 3/20/2002

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing open.

There was no further discussion.

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing closed.

NOTE: See Item 13 [Z-0003-02], Item 14 [V-0001-02], Item 15 [U-0002-02], Item 16 [U-0003-02] and Item 17 [SD-0003-02] for other related discussion.

(7:25 - 8:08)

1-3261/2-1

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING - Z-0004-02 - PERMA-BILT HOMES, ET AL - Request for a Rezoning FROM: U (Undeveloped) Zone [R (Rural Density Residential) and L (Low Density Residential) General Plan Designations] TO: R-1 (Single Family Residential) of 15 Acres adjacent to the northeast corner of Grand Canyon Drive and Solar Avenue (APN's: 125-18-801-001 through 004), PROPOSED USE: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, Ward 6 (Mack)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to conditions.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

BUCKLEY - APPROVED subject to staff's conditions, amending Condition #1 that *lots 49, 50, 62, and 63 shall be developed as open space for the proposed subdivision*; and amending Condition #13 by including the following sentence after the word City Engineer: *"unless an alternative public sewer service route is proposed to and accepted by the Department of Public Works"* – UNANIMOUS

To be heard by the City Council on 3/20/2002

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing open.

TROY JESCHKE, Planning & Development Department, explained that the proposed R-1 (Single Family Residential Zoning) is compatible with the previously approved zoning to the south and will have similar densities in future development anticipated by the General Plan Land

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 18 – Z-0004-02

MINUTES – Continued:

Use designations. In addition, no lots within the subdivision are smaller than the 6,500 square foot minimum lot size. The densities proposed under this rezoning are compatible to the R (Rural Density Residential) on the west portion of the site and the L (Low Density Residential) designation on the east portion, with implementation of the recommended conditions regarding lot totals. Therefore, staff recommended approval.

Pertaining to Item 19 [V-0002-02], MR. JESCHKE stated that the applicant is proposing to have an 18-foot front setback and a 10-foot corner side setback in conjunction with a proposed subdivision. Staff finds that in this case the unusual parcel shapes caused by the curved streets demonstrates a hardship. Approval of this request can be granted without substantially impairing the intent and purpose of any ordinance or resolution. In addition, this Variance will allow the proposed site to have the same setbacks as the approved development adjacent to the site. Staff recommended approval.

MR. JESCHKE indicated that on Item 20 [U-0005-02], staff finds the proposed private street will not negatively affect the public streets or access to the subdivision, as it will be achieving access through an existing subdivision with private streets. In addition, the private streets will not impair access to or from public facilities nor delay the response time of emergency vehicles. Staff notes that the private streets are a typical design element of residential subdivisions throughout the City and are appropriate for the proposed development. The applicant is proposing 39-foot wide private streets with rolled curbs. Staff finds the proposed street widths are appropriate and in conformance with the Las Vegas Subdivision Code Title 18. Staff recommended approval.

JENNIFER LAZOVICH, 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, appeared on behalf of the applicant and concurred with the conditions, with the exception of Conditions #1 and 13 on the zone change. Condition #1 limits the lots to 61, but MS. LAZOVICH indicated that they still would like to have 63 lots. She feels that this site has been laid out very well, and allowing two additional lots into this single story community would not have any negative impacts. In addition, the minimum lot sizes are 7,700 square feet to a maximum of 10,000 square feet.

MS. LAZOVICH stated that her engineer told her that the sewer has to be located on Elkhorn Road instead of Severance Lane. Therefore, she asked that Condition #13 be amended to reflect that change.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 18 – Z-0004-02

MINUTES – Continued:

TODD FARLOW, 240 North 19th Street, asked if the 18-foot setback requested on Item 19 [V-0002-02] includes sidewalks. MR. JESCHKE replied that sidewalks are not required as part of a private street. There will be sidewalks on Elkhorn Road and Grand Canyon Drive. MR. FARLOW stated that it behooves the Board to require sidewalks at this time, so that they would not need to be put in at a later date, when there might be no funding available. Additionally, if five feet is taken out to provide sidewalks it only allows 13 feet of space to park a car, causing pedestrians to walk into the street.

WILLIAM GRAVES, 7365 North Jensen, stated that he appeared with the intention of disputing the proposed project, but after looking at the map he likes what is proposed. His only concern was the access off of Grand Canyon Drive. Recently there was an accident at the intersection of Grand Canyon Drive and Rome Boulevard and it caused a traffic jam, and with the additional development and construction of the beltway, it will add to the traffic jam. The infrastructure should be addressed before anything else is developed.

CHAIRMAN GALATI was disappointed that the applicant did not follow through with the Board's request the first time they came in for the other 15 acres, when it was suggested that the applicant go R-PD with open space. At that time it was represented that this was only one piece and it would not extend into the rest of the site. However, now there is another R-1 piece that connects to this parcel with no open space and with a larger development. He believes that these developments need the open space and the only way to rectify this is for the applicant to provide the open space on this parcel.

COMMISSIONER McSWAIN concurred with CHAIRMAN GALATI on the open space issue. She questioned how the half-street improvements on Severance Lane and Elkhorn Road would satisfy MR. GRAVES' concerns as far as access to his property. BART ANDERSON, Public Works Department, replied that the half street improvements by themselves would not address his concerns because they would be only adjacent to this particular property. But this is an area adjacent to the Town Center residential communities that have been coming in with increasing proliferation. The overall infrastructure of the entire area of Severance Lane and Elkhorn Road is currently being planned for construction in conjunction with future developments. By the time this is built, there is a good chance that other routes will be available. Condition #14 requires a minimum of two lanes of paved legal access along a logical route, and if it can be shown that a different route would be more logical than Grand Canyon Drive, then the Traffic Engineer has the ability to force that to happen. That determination will be made as the development evolves.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 18 – Z-0004-02

MINUTES – Continued:

VICKY RICHARDS, 9620 Solar Avenue, appeared in opposition of the proposed project. She bought her property based on the fact that it was a low-density area. She asked that the access remain off of Grand Canyon Road, as well as the construction access. In addition, she asked that the applicant adhere to the 15-foot setback. She further stated that many people chose to live in the rural areas but were completely unaware of any such proposals. The open space can buffer and maintain the integrity of the communities already there, as well as support the residential diversity and architecture, instead of cookie-cutter houses. She asked that perhaps the open space could be placed in-between Grand Canyon Drive and the proposed project.

COMMISSIONER EVANS asked the applicant whether any thoughts were given on how to mitigate the open space. COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY indicated that he would be prepared to make a motion for denial, unless the applicant would like to hold this for 30 days to mitigate the concerns raised by CHAIRMAN GALATI.

CHAIRMAN GALATI asked if at this density, if this were a R-PD, what would the open space requirement be. He felt certain a solution could be worked out by reducing the number of lots. MR. JESCHKE replied that he did not have an answer at this time because it requires a mathematical formula to obtain that number. He stated that staff is requesting linear two lots to be deleted, and that two of the lots could be turned into open space in the linear park, such as lots 54 and 58 or 59 and 53. Any of those could be turned into a linear park to connect in the center of the subdivision. MS. LAZOVICH responded that she would be open to that option and apologized that she was not present for Phase 1 and not aware of the open space issue. She would prefer moving forward with the recommendation to reduce the project to 61 lots and then taking two lots and turning them into open space or park.

CHAIRMAN GALATI pointed out that if lots 49, 59, 60 and 62 were be removed, there would be a nice park serving both sides of the development. At this point, MS. LAZOVICH stated that she would concur to holding the item in abeyance, but only for two weeks so that she can meet with her client and staff to resolve the open space issue. COMMISSIONER EVANS was perplexed at the request because what he heard was that someone was disingenuous to this Board, and if that is the case, at this point it should not be at the convenience of the developer.

COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY commented that it is just a matter of calculating the open space requirement, he would not object to holding this item for two weeks. MR. JESCHKE responded that upon doing a rough estimate, based on the R-PD open space requirement, if the applicant was proposing the density as shown, they would have to provide 75,446 square feet of open space, approximately 1.25 acres of open space. That is assuming a 30-acre development at 3.5 units per acre. COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY suggested that the Board take a 10-minute recess to give some time for the applicant to contact her client regarding this issue.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 18 – Z-0004-02

MINUTES – Continued:

Once the meeting resumed, MS. LAZOVICH indicated that she was unable to contact her client, but based upon the conversations regarding the open space, she agreed to create the open space in replacing four lots in the middle of the development. CHAIRMAN GALATI was pleased with her suggestion.

MR. JESCHKE suggested that Condition #1 of Item 18 [Z-0004-02] be revised to state that the development shall be limited to 59 lots. ROBERT GENZER, Director, Planning & Development Department, recommended that a sentence be added to the condition stating that the area be utilized as open space within the development to ensure its intent. MR. JESCHKE asked if the Board wanted to list the actual lots that would be removed. COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY suggested that that motion conform to the site plan as submitted, except that the four named lots be used as open space, unless staff approves a different location.

BART ANDERSON, Public Works Department, addressed the applicant's concern regarding Condition #13 of Item 18 [Z-0004-02] regarding the location of the public sewer on Severance Lane. He recommended that the following text be added after the word City Engineer in the third line "unless an alternative public sewer service route is proposed and accepted by the Department of Public Works".

There was no further discussion.

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing closed.

NOTE: All related discussion for Item 18 [Z-0004-02], Item 19 [V-0002-02] and Item 20 [U-0005-02] was held under Item 18 [Z-0004-02].

(8:08 - 8:51)

2-1175

CONDITIONS:

Planning and Development

1. This 15-acre development shall be limited to a maximum of 61-lots.
2. A Resolution of Intent with a two-year time limit.
3. All development shall be in conformance with the site plan and building elevations, except as amended by conditions herein.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 18 – Z-0004-02

CONDITIONS – Continued:

4. Landscaping and a permanent underground sprinkler system shall be installed as required by the Planning Commission or City Council and shall be permanently maintained in a satisfactory manner.
5. A landscaping plan must be submitted prior to or at the same time application is made for a building permit.
6. All utility boxes exceeding 27 cubic feet in size shall meet the standards of Municipal Code Section 19A.12.050.
7. The applicant shall have constructed a six-foot high decorative block wall, with at least 20 percent contrasting materials, along all exterior property lines. Fence heights shall be measured from the side of the fence with the least vertical exposure above the finished grade, unless otherwise stipulated.
8. A fully operational fire protection system, including fire apparatus roads, fire hydrants and water supply, shall be installed and shall be functioning prior to construction of any combustible structures.
9. All City Code requirements and design standards of all City departments must be satisfied.
10. Submit a Petition of Vacation to Clark County for Solar Avenue between Tee Pee Lane and this site or dedicate and improve appropriate right-of-way to terminate Solar Avenue in a manner acceptable to Public Works. The Petition of Vacation shall be approved by the Clark County Commission, whichever appropriate prior to the submittal of a Final Map Technical Review for this development. The Order of Vacation shall record prior to the recordation of a Final Map adjacent to the Solar Avenue alignment.
11. Dedicate 30 feet of right-of-way adjacent to this site for Severance Lane, 40 feet for Grand Canyon Drive and a 20-foot radius on the southeast corner of Grand Canyon Drive and Severance Lane.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 18 – Z-0004-02

CONDITIONS – Continued:

12. Construct half-street improvements including appropriate overpaving, if legally able, on Grand Canyon Drive, Severance Lane and Elkhorn Road adjacent to this site concurrent with development of this site. Install all appurtenant underground facilities, if any, adjacent to this site needed for the future traffic signal system concurrent with development of this site.
13. Coordinate with the Collection Systems Planning Section of the Department of Public Works to extend public sewer in Severance Lane from El Capitan to Grand Canyon Drive to a location and depth acceptable to the City Engineer. Provide public sewer easements for all public sewers not located within existing public street right-of-way prior to the issuance of any permits. Improvement drawings submitted to the City for review shall not be approved for construction until all required public sewer easements necessary to connect this site to the existing public sewer system have been granted to the City.
14. Provide a minimum of two lanes of paved, legal access to this site along a logical route concurrent with the development of this site.
15. A Master Streetlight plan for the overall subdivision shall be approved prior to the submittal of any construction drawings for this site.
16. A Drainage Plan and Technical Drainage Study must be submitted to and approved by the Department of Public Works prior to the issuance of any building or grading permits, submittal of any construction drawings or the recordation of a Final Map for this site, whichever may occur first. Provide and improve all drainageways recommended in the approved drainage plan/study. The developer of this site shall be responsible to construct such neighborhood or local drainage facility improvements as are recommended by the approved Drainage Plan/Study concurrent with development of this site. In lieu of constructing improvements, in whole or in part, the developer may agree to contribute monies for the construction of neighborhood or local drainage improvements, the amount of such monies shall be determined by the approved Drainage Plan/Study and shall be contributed prior to the issuance of any building or grading permits, or the recordation of a Final Map, whichever may occur first, if allowed by the City Engineer.
17. The final layout of the subdivision shall be determined at the time of approval of the Tentative Map.

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING - V-0002-02 - PERMA-BILT HOMES, ET AL - Request for a Variance TO ALLOW FRONT SETBACKS OF 18 FEET WHERE 20 FEET IS THE MINIMUM REQUIRED; AND TO ALLOW CORNER SIDE SETBACKS OF 10 FEET, WHERE 15 FEET IS THE MINIMUM REQUIRED for DWELLINGS WITHIN A PROPOSED SUBDIVISION adjacent to the northeast corner of Grand Canyon Drive and Solar Avenue (APN's: 125-18-801-001 through 004), [PROPOSED: R-1 (Single Family Residential)] Ward 6 (Mack)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to conditions.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

BUCKLEY - APPROVED subject to staff's conditions - UNANIMOUS

To be heard by the City Council on 3/20/2002

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing open.

JENNIFER LAZOVICH, 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, appeared on behalf of the applicant.

There was no discussion.

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing closed.

NOTE: All related discussion for Item 18 [Z-0004-02], Item 19 [V-0002-02] and Item 20 [U-0005-02] was held under Item 18 [Z-0004-02].

(8:08 - 8:51)

2-1175

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 19 – V-0002-02

CONDITIONS:

Planning and Development

1. Approval of and conformance to the Conditions of Approval for Rezoning (Z-0004-02), Special Use Permit (U-0005-02).
2. This Variance shall expire two years from the date of final approval, unless it is exercised or an Extension of Time is granted by the City Council.

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING - **U-0005-02 - PERMA-BILT HOMES, ET AL** - Request for a Special Use Permit FOR PRIVATE STREETS WITHIN A PROPOSED SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION adjacent to the northeast corner of Grand Canyon Drive and Solar Avenue (APN's: 125-18-801-001 through 004), U (Underdeveloped) [R (Rural Density Residential) and L (Low Density Residential) General Plan Designations] [PROPOSED: R-1 (Single Family Residential)] Zone, Ward 6 (Mack)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to conditions.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

BUCKLEY - APPROVED subject to staff's conditions - UNANIMOUS

To be heard by the City Council on 3/20/2002

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing open.

JENNIFER LAZOVICH, 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, appeared on behalf of the applicant.

There was no discussion.

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing closed.

NOTE: All related discussion for Item 18 [Z-0004-02], Item 19 [V-0002-02] and Item 20 [U-0005-02] was held under Item 18 [Z-0004-02].

(8:08 - 8:51)

2-1175

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 20 – U-0005-02

CONDITIONS:

Planning and Development

1. Approval of and conformance to the Conditions of Approval for Rezoning (Z-0004-02) and Variance (V-0002-02).
2. The private streets shall be subject to all of the conditions outlined in Section 19A.04.050 of the Las Vegas Zoning Code.
3. This Special Use Permit shall expire two years from the date of final approval, unless it is exercised or an Extension of Time is granted by the City Council.
4. All City Code requirements and design standards of all City departments must be satisfied.

Public Works

5. Meet with the Traffic Engineering Representative in Land Development for assistance in the possible redesign of the proposed on site circulation layout prior to the submittal of any construction plans or the issuance of any permits, whichever may occur first. Gated driveways, if proposed, shall be designed, located and constructed in accordance with Standard Drawing #222a.
6. A Homeowner's Association shall be established to maintain all perimeter walls, private roadways, public multi-use trails, landscaping and common areas created with this development. All landscaping shall be situated and maintained so as to not create sight visibility obstructions for vehicular traffic at all development access drives and abutting street intersections. The CC&R's for the Homeowner's Association shall be submitted to and approved by the City Attorney's Office.
7. The design and layout of all onsite private circulation and access drives shall meet the approval of the Department of Fire Services prior to the issuance of any permits.
8. Site development to comply with the approved Traffic Impact Analysis and all applicable conditions of approval for Z-0004-02 and all subsequent site-related actions.

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING - Z-0005-02 - ANITA BACHINI ON BEHALF OF ERICK MENDOZA - Request for Rezoning, from R-1 (Single Family Residential), To: P-R (Professional Office and Parking) on 0.14 Acres at 1330 South Maryland Parkway (APN: 162-03-612-014), PROPOSED USE: PROFESSIONAL OFFICE, Ward 3 (Reese)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to conditions.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

EVANS - APPROVED subject to staff's conditions - UNANIMOUS

To be heard by the City Council on 3/20/2002

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing open.

ANDREW REED, Planning & Development Department, stated that regarding Item 21 [Z-0005-02], the subject site is currently designated Service Commercial on the Southeast Sector Map of the General Plan. Staff finds that the request to P-R (Professional Office and Parking) zone will be consistent with that General Plan designation. Staff recommended approval.

Pertaining to related Item 22 [Z-0005-02(1)], MR. REED indicated that the site is developed with an existing single-family dwelling that the applicant proposes to convert to office use. The applicant has submitted an agreement that allows the subject site to be accessed from the property to the south, which is also developed for office use. Two standard parking spaces

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 21 – Z-0005-02

MINUTES – Continued:

will be provided in the back of the site and one standard space and one handicap space provided in the front. A five-foot wide landscape planter with one tree is shown along the southside of the parking lot, a 16-foot wide planter with three trees is shown on the northern side of the back parking lot, a five-foot wide planter with no trees is shown on the west side of the back parking lot. City standards require a minimum eight-foot wide landscape planter along the north and west property lines of the site. The applicant is proposing a 16-foot wide planter along the property line and a five-foot wide planter along the west property line. Staff recognizes the difficulty of full compliance on a small site and finds the proposed five-foot wide planter to be acceptable because it will make a notable improvement in the side rear yard aesthetics. In order to enhance this planter, staff has included a condition about requiring the placement of two additional trees. Staff recommended approval.

ERICK MENDOZA, 4429 Narit Drive, appeared on behalf of ANITA BACHINI and concurred with staff's recommendations.

TODD FARLOW, 240 North 19th Street, asked for the percentage of the landscape reduction. MR. REED replied that the applicant is asking for a reduction along the west property. Where eight feet is required, they are proposing five feet.

COMMISSIONER EVANS pointed out that the Planning Commission approved a similar request on the other side of Maryland Parkway, and that the owner has done an exceptional job with the landscaping. Maryland Parkway once was one of the prettiest streets in the City, and he encouraged the applicant to properly maintain the landscaping. Too often the installed landscape is not taken care of once the conversion occurs. MR. MENDOZA informed COMMISSIONER EVANS that the office would have an answering service for his warehouse, which is located in a different part of town. Three secretaries will receive telephone calls for medical supplies and input them into a computer connected to a dispatch at a different location. No medical supplies will be stored at this location. MR. MENDOZA commented that it is to his benefit to maintain the landscape and keep the office as attractive as possible.

No one appeared in opposition.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 21 – Z-0005-02

MINUTES – Continued:

There was no further discussion.

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing closed.

NOTE: All discussion pertaining to Item 21 [Z-0005-02] and Item 22 [Z-0005-02(1)] was held under Item 21 [Z-0005-02].

(8:51 - 8:59)

2-2177

CONDITIONS:

Planning and Development

1 A Resolution of Intent with a two-year time limit.

2 A Site Development Plan Review application shall be approved by the Planning Commission and City Council prior to issuance of any permits, any site grading, and all development activity for the site.

Public Works

3. Remove all substandard public street improvements and unused driveway cuts adjacent to this site, if any, and replace with new improvements meeting current City Standards prior to occupancy of this site.

4. A Traffic Impact Analysis must be submitted to and approved by the Department of Public Works prior to the issuance of any building or grading permits or the submittal of any construction drawings. Comply with the recommendations of the approved Traffic Impact Analysis prior to occupancy of the site. The City shall determine area traffic mitigation contribution requirements based upon information provided in the approved Traffic Impact Analysis; such monies shall be contributed prior to the issuance of any permits for this site. Phased compliance will be allowed if recommended by the approved Traffic Impact Analysis. No recommendation of the approved Traffic Impact Analysis, nor compliance therewith, shall be deemed to modify or eliminate any condition of approval imposed by the Planning Commission or the City Council on the development of this site.

Alternatively, in lieu of a Traffic Impact Analysis, the applicant may participate in a reasonable alternative mutually acceptable to the applicant and the Department of Public Works.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 21 – Z-0005-02

CONDITIONS – Continued:

5. Meet with the Traffic Engineering Representative in Land Development for assistance in the possible redesign of the proposed on site circulation layout prior to the submittal of any construction plans or the issuance of any permits, whichever may occur first. Gated driveways, if proposed, shall be designed, located and constructed in accordance with Standard Drawing #222a.

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING - Z-0005-02(1) - ANITA BACHINI ON BEHALF OF ERICK MENDOZA - Request for a Site Development Plan Review AND A REDUCTION IN THE AMOUNT OF REQUIRED PERIMETER LANDSCAPING for a PROPOSED PROFESSIONAL OFFICE on 0.14 Acres at 1330 South Maryland Parkway (APN: 162-03-612-014), R-1 (Single Family Residential) Zone [PROPOSED: P-R (Professional Office and Parking)], Ward 3 (Reese)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to conditions.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

EVANS - APPROVED subject to staff's conditions - UNANIMOUS

To be heard by the City Council on 3/20/2002

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing open.

ERICK MENDOZA, 4429 Narit Drive, appeared on behalf of ANITA BACHINI.

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no discussion.

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing closed.

NOTE: All discussion pertaining to Item 21 [Z-0005-02] and Item 22 [Z-0005-02(1)] was held under Item 21 [Z-0005-02].

(8:51 - 8:59)

2-2177

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 22 – Z-0005-02(1)

CONDITIONS:

Planning and Development

1. The City Council shall approve a Rezoning (Z-0005-02) to a P-R (Professional Office and Parking) Zoning District.
2. This Site Development Plan Review shall expire two years from date of final approval unless it is exercised or an Extension of Time is granted by the City Council.
3. All development shall be in conformance with the site plan and building elevations, except as amended by conditions herein.
4. The landscape plan shall be revised prior to or at the same time application is made for a building permit to reflect two additional minimum 24-inch box trees within the planters depicted along the west property line.
5. Landscaping and a permanent underground sprinkler system shall be installed as required by the Planning Commission or City Council and shall be permanently maintained in a satisfactory manner. [Failure to properly maintain required landscaping and underground sprinkler systems shall be cause for revocation of a business license.]
6. A landscaping plan must be submitted prior to or at the same time application is made for a building permit.
7. All mechanical equipment, air conditioners and trash areas shall be fully screened in views from the abutting streets.
8. Parking lot lighting standards shall be no more than 20 feet in height and shall utilize 'shoe-box' fixtures and downward-directed lights. Wallpack lighting shall utilize 'shoe-box' fixtures and downward-directed lights on the proposed building. Non-residential property lighting shall be directed away from residential property or screened, and shall not create fugitive lighting on adjacent properties.
9. A fully operational fire protection system, including fire apparatus roads, fire hydrants and water supply, shall be installed and shall be functioning prior to construction of any combustible structures.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 22 – Z-0005-02(1)

CONDITIONS:

10. All City Code requirements and design standards of all City departments must be satisfied.

Public Works

11. Meet with the Traffic Engineering Representative in Land Development for assistance in the possible redesign of the proposed driveway access, on site circulation and parking lot layout prior to the submittal of any construction plans or the issuance of any permits, whichever may occur first. Driveways shall be designed, located and constructed in accordance with the intent of Standard Drawing #222a.

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING - Z-0006-02 - AMERICAN PREMIERE HOMES ON BEHALF OF TROPHY HOMES - Request for a Rezoning from R-E (Residence Estates) Zone to R-PD2 (Residential Planned Development - 2 Units Per Acre) on 5.36 Acres located adjacent to the northwest corner of Tenaya Way and Oakey Boulevard (APN's: 163-03-212-001 through 009), PROPOSED USE: SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL, Ward 1 (M. McDonald)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to conditions.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

QUINN - APPROVED subject to staff's conditions - UNANIMOUS

To be heard by the City Council on 3/20/2002

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing open.

TROY JESCHKE, Planning and Development Department, stated that the subject site is designated D-R (Desert Rural) on the Southwest Sector of the General Plan. This category allows residential density range of zero to two units per acre. The requested R-PD2 zoning will allow a maximum density of 2.49 units per acre, which will be consistent provided the allowable density does not exceed the 2.0. Staff finds the applicant is proposing a density of 1.68 units per acre, well below the allowable density of 2.0. Therefore, staff recommended approval.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 23 – Z-0006-02

MINUTES – Continued:

Regarding the Site Development Plan Review, Item 24 [Z-0006-02(1)], MR. JESCHKE indicated that access to the site will be from one driveway on Oakey Boulevard. Access to the proposed site would be through a 40-foot wide private cul-de-sac. Six-foot wide landscape planters are proposed along both Tenaya Way and Oakey Boulevard frontages. The development will consist of nine single-family custom residential lots. Even though this is a R-PD development, residential planned communities of 11 lots or less are exempt from providing open space. Staff recommended approval.

ROBERT CUNNINGHAM, 4445 South Jones Boulevard, concurred with staff's conditions.

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing closed.

NOTE: All discussion pertaining to Item 23 [Z-0006-02] and Item 24 [Z-0006-02(1)] was held under Item 23 [Z-0006-02].

(8:59 - 9:02)

2-2521

CONDITIONS:

Planning and Development

1. A Resolution of Intent with a two-year time limit.
2. The subject site shall be limited to a maximum density of 2.0 dwelling units per acre.
3. A Site Development Plan Review application shall be approved by the Planning Commission or City Council prior to issuance of any permits, any site grading, and all development activity for the site.

Public Works

4. Submit a vacation to vacate all easements in conflict with this site prior to the recordation of a Final Map on this site.
5. Grant a traffic signal chord easement at the northwest corner of Tenaya Way and Oakey Boulevard.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 23 – Z-0006-02

CONDITIONS – Continued:

6. Construct half-street improvements including appropriate overpaving on Tenaya Way and Oakey Boulevard adjacent to this site concurrent with development of this site. Install all appurtenant underground facilities, if any, adjacent to this site needed for the future traffic signal system concurrent with development of this site. All existing paving damaged or removed by this development shall be restored at its original location and to its original width concurrent with development of this site.
7. A Traffic Impact Analysis must be submitted to and approved by the Department of Public Works prior to the issuance of any building or grading permits, submittal of any construction drawings or the recordation of a Final Map for this site. Comply with the recommendations of the approved Traffic Impact Analysis prior to occupancy of the site. The City shall determine area traffic mitigation contribution requirements based upon information provided in the approved Traffic Impact Analysis; such monies shall be contributed prior to the issuance of any permits or the recordation of a Final Map for this site. If additional rights-of-way are not required and Traffic Control devices are or may be proposed at this site outside of the public right-of-way, all necessary easements for the location and/or access of such devices shall be granted prior to the issuance of permits for this site. Alternatively, in lieu of a Traffic Impact Analysis, the applicant may participate in a reasonable alternative mutually acceptable to the applicant and the Department of Public Works. Phased compliance will be allowed if recommended by the approved Traffic Impact Analysis. No recommendation of the approved Traffic Impact Analysis, nor compliance therewith, shall be deemed to modify or eliminate any condition of approval imposed by the Planning Commission or the City Council on the development of this site.
8. An addendum to the previously approved Drainage Plan and Technical Drainage Study must be submitted to and approved by the Department of Public Works prior to the issuance of any grading or building permits, submittal of any construction drawings or the recordation of a Final Map for this site, whichever may occur first. Provide and improve all drainageways as recommended in the approved drainage plan/study.

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING - Z-0006-02(1) - AMERICAN PREMIERE HOMES ON BEHALF OF TROPHY HOMES - Request for a Site Development Plan Review FOR A PROPOSED 9-LOT SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT on 5.36 Acres located adjacent to the northwest corner of Tenaya Way and Oakey Boulevard (APN's: 163-03-212-001 through 009), R-E (Residence Estates) Zone [PROPOSED: R-PD2 (Residential Planned Development - 2 Units Per Acre)], Ward 1 (M. McDonald)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to conditions.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

QUINN - APPROVED subject to staff's conditions - UNANIMOUS

To be heard by the City Council on 3/20/2002

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing open.

ROBERT CUNNINGHAM, 4445 South Jones Boulevard, concurred with staff's conditions.

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no discussion.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 24 – Z-0006-02(1)

MINUTES – Continued:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing closed.

NOTE: All discussion pertaining to Item 23 [Z-0006-02] and Item 24 [Z-0006-02(1)] was held under Item 23 [Z-0006-02].

(8:59 - 9:02)
2-2521

CONDITIONS:

1. The City Council shall approve a Rezoning (Z-0006-02) to an R-PD2 (Residential Planned Development –2 Units per Acre) Zoning District.
2. This Site Development Plan Review shall expire two years from date of final approval unless it is exercised or an Extension of Time is granted by the City Council.
3. The setbacks for this development shall be 20 feet in the front, 10 feet on each side, 15 feet on a corner side yard, and 20 feet in the rear.
4. Streetscape landscaping shall be in conformance with the submitted site plan and landscape plan, which conforms to the requirements of the Las Vegas Urban Design Guidelines and Standards.
5. The applicant shall have constructed a six-foot tall decorative block wall, with at least 20 percent contrasting materials, along the street frontages. Fence heights shall be measured from the side of the fence with the least vertical exposure above the finished grade, unless otherwise stipulated.
6. Air conditioning units shall not be mounted on rooftops.
7. All City Code requirements and design standards of all City departments must be satisfied.
8. All development shall be in conformance with the site plan and building elevations, except as amended by conditions herein.

Public Works

9. All active gated access drives shall be designed, located and constructed in accordance with Standard Drawing #222a.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 24 – Z-0006-02(1)

CONDITIONS – Continued:

10. A Homeowner's Association shall be established to maintain all perimeter walls, private roadways, landscaping and common areas created with this development. All landscaping shall be situated and maintained so as to not create sight visibility obstructions for vehicular traffic at all development access drives and abutting street intersections. The CC&R's for the Homeowner's Association shall be submitted to and approved by the City Attorney's Office.
11. The design and layout of all onsite private circulation and access drives shall meet the approval of the Department of Fire Services prior to the issuance of any permits.
12. Site development to comply with all applicable conditions of approval for Z-0006-02.
13. The final layout of this site shall be determined at the time of approval of the Tentative Map.

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING - V-0003-02 - JON G. GRIFFIN - Request for a Variance TO ALLOW A SIX FOOT TALL SOLID BLOCK WALL IN A PORTION OF THE FRONT YARD WHERE A TWO FOOT TALL SOLID WALL IS PERMITTED; AND TO ALLOW FOUR FEET OF GREEN NETTING ON TOP OF AN EXISTING FOUR FOOT TALL WALL WHERE A SIX FOOT WALL IS PERMITTED on property located at 8010 Maverick Street (APN: 125-11-806-010), R-E (Residence Estates) Zone, Ward 6 (Mack)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to conditions.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

TRUEDELL – ABEYANCE to 2/28/02 - UNANIMOUS

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing open.

ANDREW REED, Planning and Development Department, explained that the request is for a variance to allow a six-foot high solid block wall on a portion of the front yard where a two-foot solid wall is permitted, and to allow four feet of green netting on top of an existing four-foot high wall where a six-foot wall is permitted. The applicant's justification letter states that the netting will be placed around an equestrian area. Additionally, the applicant states that the proposed wall is common in the context of the surrounding neighborhood. Staff finds that a strict literal interpretation of the Zoning Code for the proposed configuration would unnecessarily burden the applicant's enjoyment of his property in that such screening is expressly permitted in the case of another sport/recreational use elsewhere in the code. Therefore staff supports the applicant's request.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 25 – V-0003-02

MINUTES – Continued:

MR. REED recommended that a sentence be added at the end of Condition #2 stating that prior to the issuance of permits for this site, a covenant running with the land for possible future installation of a 24-foot wide equestrian trail adjacent to the north right-of-way line of Grand Teton Drive. The covenant agreement must be recorded with the County Recorder and a copy of the recorded document must be provided to the City prior to the issuance of any permits for this site.

GREG GRIFFIN, 8010 Maverick Street, was confused with Condition #2 as amended by staff and Condition #7. He is not certain if that easement is part of the right-of-way of Grand Teton Drive or whether his property will be taken. MR. REED replied that the right-of-way in this trail is separate. If the trail were ever to be developed in the area, the property owner would be required to give 20 feet of his property for that trail. MR. GRIFFIN argued that he obtained the permit to build the barn and arena, putting the barn 25 feet off of the property line, taking into consideration the 10-foot easement. Now, if he wants to erect a wall, he would have to tear the barn, destroy and rebuild the footings and again rebuild the barn. He pointed out that homes along Jones Boulevard to Maverick Street facing Grand Teton have walls, front yards and driveways that may have to be destroyed if the trail goes through. He asked if he would have been able to build the wall had he not asked for the Variance. CHAIRMAN GALATI replied that he still requires a permit for the wall. He questioned what happens if there are structures in the way of the trails. MR. REED replied that at this time there is no requirement to relocate the barn. MR. GRIFFIN reiterated that he cannot build the wall without destroying the barn because he cannot meet the requirements. MR. REED indicated that if that is the case, with the condition as written, the wall would need to be setback to account for the trail, and the applicant would need to choose either the barn or the wall.

ROBERT GENZER, Planning & Development Department, suggested that the item be abeyed for two weeks so that staff can meet with the applicant to discuss the barn/trail issue. MR. GRIFFIN concurred with the abeyance.

TODD FARLOW, 240 North 19th Street, commented that the trails should be maintained.

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing closed.

(9:02 - 9:09)

2-2680

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING - V-0102-01 - CHRIST LUTHERAN CHURCH - Request for a Variance TO ALLOW A PROPOSED SIGN TO BE 14 FEET, SIX INCHES IN HEIGHT WHERE 12 FEET IS THE MAXIMUM HEIGHT PERMITTED; AND ZERO FEET FROM THE FRONT PROPERTY LINE WHERE FIVE FEET IS THE MINIMUM SETBACK REQUIRED in conjunction with an existing church at 111 North Torrey Pines Drive (APN: 138-26-403-001), C-V (Civic) Zone, Ward 1 (M. McDonald)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to conditions.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

QUINN - APPROVED subject to staff's condition - UNANIMOUS

This is final action.

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing open.

ANDREW REED, Planning and Development Department, stated that hardship is demonstrated by the size of the adjacent overpass right-of-way, which creates a hardship on this site, in that any signage will be located a minimum of 40 feet from the Torrey Pines Drive traffic lanes. Approval of this request can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good or without impairing the intent and purpose of an ordinance or resolution. Staff recommended approval.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 26 – V-0102-01

MINUTES – Continued:

ED CONSOLI, 3555 West Naples, concurred with staff's recommendations.

TODD FARLOW, 240 North 19th Street, expressed his support for the proposed sign after viewing a picture.

COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY asked the reason for the two feet, six inches over the 12 feet. MR. CONSOLI responded that because the new Torrey Pines Drive overpass is elevated by that amount and they are compensating for that elevation.

There was no further discussion.

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing closed.

(9:09 - 9:12)

2-3170

CONDITIONS:

Planning and Development

1. This Variance shall expire two years from the date of final approval, unless it is exercised or an Extension of Time is granted by the City Council.

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING - V-0005-02 - GERALDINE HUGHES - Request for a Variance TO ALLOW A PROPOSED MINI-STORAGE FACILITY TO BE ZERO FEET FROM THE SIDE PROPERTY LINE WHERE 10 FEET IS THE MINIMUM SETBACK REQUIRED, AND 10 FEET FROM THE FRONT PROPERTY LINE WHERE 20 FEET IS THE MINIMUM SETBACK REQUIRED on property located adjacent to the south side of Vegas Drive, approximately 100 feet west of Pyramid Drive (APN: 139-30-501-003), R-1 (Single Family Residential) Zone under Resolution of Intent to C-1 (Limited Commercial), Ward 5 (Weekly)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends DENIAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

GOYNES – STRIKE - UNANIMOUS

NOTE: An initial denial motion by GOYNES, which carried unanimously was reconsidered pursuant to a motion by GOYNES, which also carried unanimously.

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing open.

ANDREW REED, Planning and Development Department, stated that the applicant proposes to construct a mini-storage facility 10 feet from the front property line adjacent to Vegas Drive, where the minimum setback is 10 feet. Additional covered parking structures for recreational vehicle are shown with no setback from the east and west property lines where 10 feet is the minimum setback required. Staff finds no evidence of unique or extraordinary circumstances and that the applicant has created a self-imposed hardship by attempting to overbuild this site.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 27 – V-0005-02

MINUTES – Continued:

Alternative site plans are possible that would allow either construction and conformance to Title 19 setback requirements or would require less deviation from the development standards. In view of the absence of any hardships imposed by this site physical characteristics, staff concludes that the applicant's hardship is preferential in nature and therefore outside the realm of the Nevada Revised Statute for granting the Variance. Therefore, staff recommended denial.

In regard to Item 28 [U-0006-02], MR. REED explained that a single driveway to Vegas Drive provides access to the site. The plan indicates a proposal for a 136-unit mini storage facility consisting of three structures. The storage area for 17 recreational vehicles is shown along the east property line with an additional 17 spaces along the west property line. These spaces are proposed to be covered by a parking structure located on the west property line and which is the subject of a related variance application. Because the applicant is seeking setback variances for three of the four property lines, staff finds that the use as currently proposed is too intense for the subject site. The proposed use could possibly be simple for the property if the Site Development Plan Review that is compatible with the surrounding residential development were revised. Staff recommended denial.

Item 29 [Z-0071-98(4)], MR. REED indicated that a single driveway to Vegas Drive provides access to the site. The plan indicates a 136-unit mini storage facility consisting of three structures. A 10-foot wide planter with palm trees is shown along Vegas Drive. No landscaping is shown along the three remaining property lines. The elevations for the mini-storage facility indicate that the manager's office will have a stucco exterior with a concrete tile roof. The remainder of the mini-storage facility will consist of pre-manufactured metal buildings. The proposed waiver of a minimum eight-foot wide landscape planter along the southeast and west property lines and the reduction to 10 feet of the planter along Vegas Drive is not consistent with the urban design guidelines. The design guidelines state that the landscape requirement should only be waived when there is a unique or unusual hardship. Staff finds no evidence of a hardship. The design standards also state that the building material should be selected on the basis of compatibility with the neighboring area. Staff finds that the proposed pre-fabricated metal buildings are aesthetically unappealing and not appropriate in close proximity to existing residential dwellings with stucco brick or wood siding exteriors.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 27 – V-0005-02

MINUTES – Continued:

Goal 2 of the Las Vegas 2020 Master Plan states that mature neighborhoods will be sustained and improved through appropriate and selective high quality redevelopment and preservation. A policy of that goal states that development on vacant or underutilized lots within existing residential neighborhoods shall be sensitive in use and design to surrounding development. Staff finds that the lack of landscaping buffers between the proposed mini-storage facility and the adjacent residential development and the incompatible exterior building materials are not consistent with this goal of the Las Vegas 2020 Master Plan. Staff recommended denial.

GREG MOORE, 4427 Via Torino, appeared on behalf of GERALDINE HUGHES and clarified that 172 notices were mailed, zero protests and zero approvals were received. MR. REED explained that there was a late protest received too late to be included within the staff report. MR. MOORE explained that he has requested the installation of covered parking on the east and west property lines and removal of the landscaping from the east, west and south property lines. His property line is two feet further to the south and east because the original homes along Pyramid Drive were built six feet higher. There was an original six-foot high wall for the rear yards of those homes and a six-foot high retaining wall built inside of their wall with a six-foot high block wall on top of that. Therefore, the distance from the ground to the top of the wall currently is 12 feet. The homes have small rear yards and there is no place on the street or side property for landscaping. Additionally, the interior landscaping will not be visible from the outside. He indicated that MR. PICKFORD, who lives to the west of his property, is in the process of zoning his property to C-1. Properties along Decatur Boulevard are either zoned commercial or industrial.

Currently, there is no landscaping on either side of Vegas Drive from Rancho Drive to Decatur Boulevard, with the exception of the frontage of the City yard that has 10-foot tall palm trees. He proposes to install matching palm trees similar to those found on the golf course, ranging in height from 30 to 50 feet tall. He disagreed with staff that the mini storage would visually impact the adjacent neighbors. In fact, back in 1998 when he met with these neighbors they were happy that a project was being built at this location. There will be no more than three cars parked at this mini storage location. The metal buildings will not be visible from the street or the neighbors' properties.

TODD FARLOW, 240 North 19th Street, stated that it is time this property is developed with landscaping and sidewalks. However, the project as presented is too intense for this size lot.

THOMAS SOLFE, Briarglen Lane, asked about the time of operations for the mini storage, the exact height of the buildings and the type of lighting that would be used. He does not want his

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 27 – V-0005-02

MINUTES – Continued:

backyard to be too bright. There are other commercial vacant properties along Vegas Drive and Decatur Boulevard that have not been developed. CHAIRMAN GALATI clarified that this particular property is already zoned commercial. The Board would be considering the Variance, Special Use Permit and the Site Development Plan Review.

NICK PICKFORD, 3909 Vegas Drive, supports the application, as long as vehicles or buildings cannot be seen from his property. The eight-foot wall would mitigate that issue. As MR. MOORE indicated, there is no landscaping on the street, with the exception of the private homes across from the golf course. A line of palm trees would be appropriate.

MARSHALL MASEK, 3908 Vegas Drive, indicated that after speaking with the applicant and seeing the plans, he supports the project. The palm trees, sidewalks and landscaping would improve the surrounding area.

COMMISSIONER McSWAIN asked about the type of wall that would face Vegas Drive. MR. MOORE replied that it would be split-face masonry with fluted split-face on the top. As far as providing additional landscaping, MR. MOORE stated that he would have to remove a building or a row of parking. COMMISSIONER McSWAIN inquired about what the applicant would have to do to install sidewalks and streetlights. BART ANDERSON, Public Works Department, replied that when the site came forth for rezoning in 1998, the applicant was required to construct and complete all off sites, including sidewalk and streetlights. This was imposed as a condition of approval. MR. MOORE indicated that he was not aware of that, but that he would comply.

COMMISSIONER GOYNES expressed concern about the project being unsightly and not happy with the pre-fabricated metal buildings. Additionally, the project does not meet the urban design standards, as well as landscaping. The 2020 Master Plan is to enhance this particular area with trees and shrubbery.

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL commented that, as the applicant indicated, there would be no landscaping along Vegas Drive, except for golf course frontage. He cannot support this project if the eight-foot block wall would be the only thing that can be seen. The pre-fabricated buildings come in 10 and 15 feet modular and can be set back to create room for the landscaping. The proposed project is overbuilt and under-landscaped. He recommended that the item be held until the applicant and staff find an appropriate site configuration to mitigate the issues.

COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY concurred with COMMISSIONERS GOYNES and TRUESDELL'S comments, but pointed out that when this property was zoned C-1 it was limited to mini-storage and RV storage.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 27 – V-0005-02

MINUTES – Continued:

MR. MOORE remarked that he would be willing to provide additional landscaping in the front. CHAIRMAN GALATI noted that it would be appropriate for MR. MOORE to come back with a different plan. CHRIS GLORE, Planning and Development Department, explained that the site plan review application was incomplete and recommended that the other applications move forward, but that the site plan review be stricken so that the applicant can submit completed applications that conform, not only to the code requirements, but also to the directions given by the Planning Commission.

CHAIRMAN GALATI asked CITY ATTORNEY BRYAN SCOTT what consideration the Board would have in a Special Use Permit since this was limited only to the mini-storage and RV storage. CITY ATTORNEY SCOTT replied that if the deed restriction was recorded on the property and the Special Use Permit is denied, the economic viability of the property might be destroyed for at least 10 years because that is the only use allowed.

CHAIRMAN GALATI questioned MR. MOORE whether he recorded a deed restriction on this property. He responded in the affirmative, but did not have the actual document with him. Due to the fact that the applicant was not certain about the deed restriction, COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY recommended that Item 28 [U-0006-02] be tabled. Therefore, COMMISSIONER GOYNES moved to table the item until a determination could be made on whether a restriction was imposed on the property.

VICE-CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL requested that all the issues should be resolved before moving forward with the site plan. He would prefer the item be stricken and have it properly submitted.

CHAIRMAN GALATI suggested that Item 27 [V-0005-02] be reconsidered. COMMISSIONER GOYNES moved to reconsider the item and then moved to strike.

There was no further discussion.

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing closed.

NOTE: All discussion pertaining to Item 27 [V-0005-02], Item 28 [U-0006-02] and Item 29 [Z-0071-98(4)] was held under Item 27 [V-0005-02].

(9:12 - 9:45)

2-3170/3-

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING - U-0006-02 - GERALDINE HUGHES - Request for a Special Use Permit FOR A PROPOSED MINI-STORAGE FACILITY on property located adjacent to the south side of Vegas Drive, approximately 100 feet west of Pyramid Drive (APN: 139-30-501-003), R-1 (Single Family Residential) Zone under Resolution of Intent to C-1 (Limited Commercial), Ward 5 (Weekly)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends DENIAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

GOYNES – TABLED - UNANIMOUS

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing open.

GREG MOORE, 4427 Via Torino, appeared on behalf of GERALDINE HUGHES.

There was no discussion.

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing closed.

NOTE: All discussion pertaining to Item 27 [V-0005-02], Item 28 [U-0006-02] and Item 29 [Z-0071-98(4)] was held under Item 27 [V-0005-02].

(9:12 - 9:45)

2-3170/3-1

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING - Z-0071-98(4) - GERALDINE HUGHES - Request for a Site Development Plan Review and a Reduction in the Amount of Required Perimeter and Parking Lot Landscaping FOR A PROPOSED 22,900 SQUARE FOOT MINI-STORAGE FACILITY on property located adjacent to the south side of Vegas Drive, approximately 100 feet west of Pyramid Drive (APN: 139-30-501-003) R-1 (Single Family Residential) Zone under Resolution of Intent to C-1 (Limited Commercial), Ward 5 (Weekly)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends DENIAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

GOYNES – STRIKE - UNANIMOUS

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing open.

There was no discussion.

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing closed.

NOTE: All discussion pertaining to Item 27 [V-0005-02], Item 28 [U-0006-02] and Item 29 [Z-0071-98(4)] was held under Item 27 [V-0005-02].

(9:12 - 9:45)

2-3170/3-1

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING - U-0167-01 - GILBERT LEVY ON BEHALF OF REAGAN NATIONAL ADVERTISING - Request for a Special Use Permit FOR A PROPOSED 24-FOOT BY 28-FOOT OFF-PREMISE ADVERTISING (BILLBOARD) SIGN at 401 West Bonanza Road (APN: 139-27-401-016), M (Industrial) Zone, Ward 5 (Weekly)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends DENIAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

GOYNES – DENIED – UNANIMOUS

Final Action

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing open.

TROY JESCHKE, Planning and Development, explained that off-premise advertising signs are normally appropriate in industrial areas under most circumstances but the subject site is located in the downtown redevelopment area and the proposed use is in conflict with the objectives of that plan which calls for the elimination of blight.

LEE COTE, 7181 South Industrial Road, representing the applicant, stated that a revised plan was submitted which addressed each of the topics requested by staff. The applicant has lowered the sign height to 40 feet overall, has moved it further to the east as recommended to locate it away from the traffic light to prevent any hindrance, meets the 300-foot separation and reduced the sign width to 2 ½ feet. Responding to CHAIRMAN GALATI, MR. COTE replied that the applicant has agreed to the recommended conditions.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 30 – U-0167-01

MINUTES – Continued:

MR. JESCHKE clarified that although the applicant did submit a revised plan, it did not actually prove that it met the 300-foot separation from the nearest billboard which is located at the homeless shelter.

TODD FARLOW, 240 North 19th Street, commented that this sign should be removed.

COMMISSIONER GOYNES stated that he could not support this application because it did not meet the redevelopment plan for the downtown area and would only add to the existing blight in the neighborhood. COMMISSIONER McSWAIN also voiced her non-support because it appears that the sign will tower over the existing structures and be highly visible from the freeway. VICE-CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL informed MR. COTE about the current sign ordinance that regulates billboard types, size and dimensions. He expressed that the City does not need another billboard located in the middle of a junk-yard.

There was no further discussion

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing closed.

(9:45 – 9:55)

3-809

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING - U-0168-01 - JOHNSON EARL TRUST ON BEHALF OF REAGAN NATIONAL ADVERTISING - Request for a Special Use Permit FOR A 24-FOOT BY 28-FOOT OFF-PREMISE) ADVERTISING (BILLBOARD) SIGN at 2665 South Highland Drive (APN: 162-09-110-001), M (Industrial) Zone, Ward 3 (Reese)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

2

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

0

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends DENIAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report
4. Submitted at Meeting: Colored photographs of proposed sign location.

MOTION:

BUCKLEY – DENIED – UNANIMOUS with TRUESDELL abstaining because he represents a property owner who lives adjacent to the subject property.

Final Action

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing open.

TROY JESCHKE, Planning and Development, explained that the sign meets the 300-foot clearance from any other off-premise advertising sign and is not within 50 feet of any intersection of two public rights-of-way. The sign is an appropriate use in this industrial area and meets the provisions of the Municipal Code.

LEE COTE, 7181 South Industrial, represented the applicant and concurred with staff's recommendations.

TODD FARLOW, 240 North 19th Street, opposed the request for a special use permit.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 31 – U-0168-01

MINUTES – Continued:

ALLEN CREEL, owner of Creel Printing Company, 2701 Westwood Drive, spoke in opposition to the erection of the proposed sign in the vicinity of his business. He asserted that the grounds as well as employee and customer parking areas are constantly maintained. He employs his own crew to paint out graffiti and regularly keep the surrounding areas clean. Where the sign is to be erected, the business owners have precluded that it is not appropriate inasmuch as it promotes adult oriented businesses. MR. CREEL asked for the Commission's support because he strongly opposes this project and felt it has no place in this business community. Additionally, because he employs over 150 women, he felt that this type of adult-oriented signage would be very intimidating.

ATTORNEY SCOTT EATON, representing the Creel Printing Company, commented on the fact that this project would not be compatible with the surrounding area.

ROBERT GENZER, Director of Planning and Development, asked Public Works to verify whether or not Highland and Presidio were public rights-of-way. BART ANDERSON replied that they were. Based on that clarification, MR. GENZER announced that placement of the sign would therefore not meet the criteria of Title 19a.14.100.C9 because it would be within 50 feet of the intersection of two public rights-of-way.

COMMISSIONER McSWAIN agreed with the relative comments made by VICE-CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL on a previous item, and supported MR. CREEL'S comments in dissension of this project.

There was no further discussion.

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing closed.

(9:55 – 10:08)

3-1167

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING - U-0001-02 - DIANA ZOE JOSEPHS AND MATTHEWS FAMILY TRUST ON BEHALF OF TRANSITION SERVICES - Request for a Special Use Permit FOR A PROPOSED SOCIAL SERVICE PROVIDER (TRANSITION SERVICES) located at 1807 West Charleston Boulevard (APN's: 162-04-112-021), C-1 (Limited Commercial) Zone, Ward 1 (M. McDonald)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends DENIAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

TRUEDELL - APPROVED subject to staff's conditions - UNANIMOUS

To be heard by the City Council on 3/20/2002

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing open.

ANDREW REED, Planning and Development, explained that the service requested is compatible with existing surrounding land uses.

GREG BORGEL, 300 South 4th Street, represented the applicant and accepted all of staff's recommendations. He explained that previously, the facility was used for social services and had been exempt from the special use permit requirement because of University Medical Center sponsorship. The services currently proposed are not considered non-profit and therefore, staff determined that a special use permit would be required.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 32 – U-0001-02

MINUTES – Continued:

CHAIRMAN GALATI asked for an explanation of transition service. MR. BORGEL explained that services are provided to young adults who range in age from early teens upward to 25 years old. The majority of young people are intellectually challenged and require training for minimal level jobs so they can be transitioned into the working environment.

VICE-CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL stated that he has seen this operation in progress and it is a wonderful asset to the medical community.

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing closed.

(10:08 – 10:11))

3-1641

CONDITIONS:

Planning and Development

1. If this Special Use Permit is not exercised within one (1) year after the approval, the Special Use Permit shall be void unless an Extension of Time is granted.
2. All City Code requirements and design standards of all City departments must be satisfied.

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING - Z-0026-91(12) - RITA K. ALLEYNE - Request for a Site Development Plan Review FOR A PROPOSED CONVERSION OF A 1,590 SQUARE FOOT RESIDENCE TO AN OFFICE; AND FOR A REDUCTION IN THE AMOUNT OF REQUIRED PERIMETER LANDSCAPING on 0.17 Acres at 336 South Jones Boulevard (APN: 138-36-210-009), R-1 (Single Family Residential) Zone under Resolution of Intent to P-R (Professional Offices and Parking), Ward 1 (M. McDonald)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to conditions.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

McSWAIN- APPROVED subject to staff's conditions and adding the following conditions:

- *The applicant must clean up and maintain the front area and repair any portion of the existing building as appropriate.*

- UNANIMOUS

To be heard by the City Council on 3/20/2002

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing open.

ANDREW REED, Planning and Development, mentioned that the proposed office is within the range of permitted uses of the P-R zoning. The location and design are in compliance with City standards and staff recommends approval.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 33 – Z-0026-91(12)

MINUTES – Continued:

MICHAEL PETRI, 7220 Smoke Ranch Road, appeared on behalf of RITA K. ALLEYNE, who was unable to stay the remainder of the meeting due to a previous commitment. MR. PETRI explained that the residence had been converted to commercial zoning and the only reservation MS. ALLEYNE had was with Condition No. 11 pertaining to the driveway. She asked if the driveway could remain as is. BART ANDERSON, Public Works, stated that those conditions are standard and imposed on all applicants; however, MS. ALLEYNE can elect to meet with staff and a determination can be made as to whether the condition stands or whether the driveways could remain. CHAIRMAN GALATI recommended leaving the condition as stated and having the applicant meet with the Traffic Engineer.

TODD FARLOW, 240 North 19th Street, commented that there should be more landscaping.

COMMISSIONER McSWAIN requested a condition requiring the applicant to clean up the front yard be added to the list of conditions.

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing closed.

(10:11 – 10:17)

3-1770

CONDITIONS:

Planning and Development

1. This Site Development Plan Review shall expire two years from date of final approval unless it is exercised or an Extension of Time is granted by the City Council.
2. Landscape and maintain all landscaping within the rear yard as depicted on the submitted landscape plan. Any dead landscaping material shall be removed and replaced with new landscaping.
3. All development shall be in conformance with the site plan and building elevations, except as amended by conditions herein.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 33 – Z-0026-91(12)

CONDITIONS – Continued:

4. Landscaping and a permanent underground sprinkler system shall be installed as required by the Planning Commission or City Council and shall be permanently maintained in a satisfactory manner. [Failure to properly maintain required landscaping and underground sprinkler systems shall be cause for revocation of a business license.]
5. A landscaping plan must be submitted prior to or at the same time application is made for a building permit.
6. All mechanical equipment, air conditioners and trash areas shall be fully screened in views from the abutting streets.
7. Parking lot lighting standards shall be no more than 20 feet in height and shall utilize ‘shoe-box’ fixtures and downward-directed lights. Wallpack lighting shall utilize ‘shoe-box’ fixtures and downward-directed lights on the proposed building. Non-residential property lighting shall be directed away from residential property or screened, and shall not create fugitive lighting on adjacent properties.
8. All utility boxes exceeding 27 cubic feet in size shall meet the standards of Municipal Code Section 19A.12.050.
9. A fully operational fire protection system, including fire apparatus roads, fire hydrants and water supply, shall be installed and shall be functioning prior to construction of any combustible structures.
10. All City Code requirements and design standards of all City departments must be satisfied.

Public Works

11. Remove all substandard public street improvements and unused driveway cuts adjacent to this site, if any, and replace with new improvements meeting current City Standards prior to occupancy of this site.
12. The proposed driveway access, on site circulation and parking lot layout shall meet the approval of the Traffic Engineering Representative in Land Development prior to the submittal of any construction plans or the issuance of any permits, whichever may occur first. Driveways should be designed, located and constructed to meet the intent of Standard Drawing #222a.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 33 – Z-0026-91(12)

CONDITIONS – Continued:

13. A Traffic Impact Analysis must be submitted to and approved by the Department of Public Works prior to the submittal of any construction drawings or the issuance of any building or grading permits, whichever may occur first. Comply with the recommendations of the approved Traffic Impact Analysis prior to occupancy of the site. The City shall determine area traffic mitigation contribution requirements based upon information provided in the approved Traffic Impact Analysis; such monies shall be contributed prior to the issuance of any permits for this site. The Traffic Impact Analysis shall also include a section addressing Standard Drawings #234.1 #234.2 and #234.3 to determine additional right-of-way requirements adjacent to this site, if any; dedicate all areas recommended by the approved Traffic Impact Analysis. All additional rights-of-way required by Standard Drawing #201.1 shall be dedicated prior to or concurrent with the commencement of on-site development activities unless specifically noted as not required in the approved Traffic Impact Analysis. Phased compliance will be allowed if recommended by the approved Traffic Impact Analysis. No recommendation of the approved Traffic Impact Analysis, nor compliance therewith, shall be deemed to modify or eliminate any condition of approval imposed by the Planning Commission or the City Council on the development of this site.

Alternatively, in lieu of a Traffic Impact Analysis, the applicant may participate in a reasonable alternative mutually acceptable to the applicant and the Department of Public Works.
14. If on street parking is not already prohibited adjacent to this site, submit a written request to the Traffic Engineer to eliminate on-street parking on Jones Boulevard adjacent to this site.
15. Hard Surface (*if allowed by Planning and Development*) and/or landscape all unimproved right-of-way, if any unimproved area exists, on Jones Boulevard adjacent to this site prior to the issuance of a business license. Maintain all such improvements in perpetuity. All landscaping installed with this project shall be situated and maintained so as not to create sight visibility obstructions for vehicular traffic at all development access drives and abutting street intersections.
16. Obtain an Occupancy Permit for all landscaping and private improvements in the Jones Boulevard public right-of-way adjacent to this site.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 33 – Z-0026-91(12)

CONDITIONS – Continued:

17. Site development to comply with all applicable conditions of approval for Z-26-91, all other subsequent site-related actions, and the Conditions of Approval of the approved Traffic Impact Analysis for Jones Boulevard, Upland Boulevard to Evergreen Avenue.

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING - Z-0095-91(4) - BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT ON BEHALF OF NEVADA POWER - Required One Year Review of an approved Review of Condition WHICH ALLOWED THE DEFERMENT OF THE INSTALLATION OF THE REQUIRED LANDSCAPING IN CONJUNCTION WITH AN ELECTRICAL SUBSTATION on 20 Acres located adjacent to the northwest corner of Decatur Boulevard and Iron Mountain Road (APN: 125-01-701-001), C-V (Civic) Zone, Ward 6 (Mack)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to conditions.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

TRUESDELL - APPROVED subject to staff's conditions and amending Condition No. 1 by deleting the words *by the Department of Building and Safety* – **UNANIMOUS**

To be heard by the City Council on 3/20/2002

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing open.

TROY JESCHKE, Planning and Development, explained that three of the original conditions required landscaping improvements to provide visual screening from the adjacent roadways and developments. At present, the surrounding properties are undeveloped and the nearest water line is well over 2,000 feet away from the project site.

PRISCILLA BALZ, 6226 W. Sahara, representing Nevada Power, concurred with all conditions.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 34 – Z-0095-91(4)

MINUTES – Continued:

COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY asked if the School District is required to get a Certificate of Occupancy issued by the City. MR. JESCHKE confirmed that the City Building Department requires that before occupancy takes place.

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing closed.

(10:17 – 10:20)

3-1997

CONDITIONS:

Planning and Development

1. The deferment of the required landscaping shall be in allowed until a Certificate of Occupancy has been issued by the Department of Building and Safety for the Clark County School located to the south of this site.
2. Site Development shall comply to the Conditions of Approval for Zoning Application (Z-0095-91), Site Development Plan Review [Z-0095-91(1)], and all subsequent site-related actions as required by the Planning and Development Department and the Department of Public Works.
3. Condition of Approval # 8 of Site Development Plan Review [Z-0095-91(1)] shall be stricken from this review, as it is no longer relevant to the site.

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING - **Z-0076-98(26)** - **SOUTHWEST HOMES LIMITED** - Request for a Site Development Plan Review FOR A PROPOSED 495-UNIT, 4-STORY APARTMENT COMPLEX on 20.6 Acres adjacent to the northeast corner of Elkhorn Road and Campbell Road (APN: 125-17-401-005), T-C (Town Center) Zone [M-TC (Medium Density Residential-Town Center) Land Use Designation], Ward 6 (Mack)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to conditions.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

GOYNES - APPROVED subject to staff's conditions and deletion of Condition No. 2 -
UNANIMOUS

Final Action

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing open.

ANDREW REED, Planning and Development, stated that the access entries will be from Elkhorn Road or Campbell Road. The landscaping shown will be on the perimeter property lines and within the parking area. Staff determined that there is an orderly placement of the buildings and parking. A condition was added requiring the developer to construct and landscape the median with the maintenance responsibilities to be assigned to the homeowners association. All of the elevations are in compliance with Town Center Development Standards.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 35 – Z-0076-98(26)

MINUTES – Continued:

JENNIFER LAZOVICH, 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, and GREG BORGEL, 300 South 4th Street, represented the applicant. MS. LAZOVICH stated that all of the conditions were reviewed and the applicant concurs with the exception of Condition No. 2. MR. BORGEL thanked staff for the favorable recommendations. Referring to the open space, he expressed that the open space requirement has not only been met but far exceeds the normal prerequisite. MR. BORGEL asked about Condition No. 2 which referenced three buildings to the south of the clubhouse and used the overhead to point out the buildings to verify they were speaking of the same structures. MR. BORGEL stated that the applicant prefers not to move the buildings up against Campbell Road. He noted that the Town Center Standards does permit landscaping and berming if the buildings are not put up against the street frontage.

MR. BORGEL mentioned that the developer has designed a project that maximizes the open space by placement of the units near the clubhouse, pool area and park facility. He suggested that there would be no aesthetic public perspective gained by pulling the buildings to the street frontage and that the Standards actually focus on commercial development rather than residential development.

TODD FARLOW, 240 North 19th Street, agreed with MR. BORGEL and stated that this is a nice looking set of buildings.

LOUISE RUSKAMP, 8500 Log Cabin Way, asked about the location of the trash enclosures. MR. BORGEL explained that they are located throughout the project but not anywhere near the street frontage. MS. RUSKAMP'S query related to trash recycling. MR. BORGEL stated that he understood that Republic Services does not run a recycling program within any apartment complex.

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing closed.

(10:20 – 10:30)

3-2135

CONDITIONS:

Planning and Development

1. This Site Development Plan Review shall expire two years from date of final approval unless it is exercised or an Extension of Time is granted by the City Council.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 35 – Z-0076-98(26)

CONDITIONS – Continued:

2. The three apartment buildings immediately to the south of the clubhouse/pool area shall be setback 20 feet from the south property line, immediately adjacent to the landscape planter, as required by the Town Center Development Standards (TCDS).
3. A detailed landscaping plan shall be approved by the Planning and Development Department staff, prior to application for a building permit, that depicts the landscaping and hardscaped areas in the Campbell Road, Severance Lane and Elkhorn Road Amenity Zones as shown in the TCDS. The landscape plan shall detail plant types, sizes and locations as required by the TCDS. On site trees shall conform to the landscaping standards Town Center. Palm trees shall be at least 25 feet in height. All other trees shall be 18 feet in height. The landscape plan shall include sufficient information to confirm conformance with spacing requirements.
4. The intersections of Campbell Road and Elkhorn Road and Campbell Road and Severance Lane shall comply with the design of Intersection Type B as specified by the TCDS.
5. The developer shall construct and landscape a 15-foot wide median within Elkhorn Road as required by the Town Center Standards
6. All components of the development shall be interconnected by designated pedestrian pathways
7. Public amenities such as courtyards, plazas, patios, gazebos or fountains shall be provided within the open space area immediately to the west of the pool.
8. The landscape plan shall be revised and approved by Planning and Development Department staff, prior to the time application is made for a building permit, indicating the total amount of open space and landscaping.

Public Works

9. Coordinate with the Nevada Department of Transportation to determine whether any additional right-of-way is required adjacent to the northeast corner of this site for the existing or ultimate frontage road. Provide proof that such dedication is not required or if such dedication is required it shall be provided prior to the issuance of any building or grading permits for this site.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 35 – Z-0076-98(26)

CONDITIONS – Continued:

10. Dedicate 50 feet of right-of-way adjacent to this site for Elkhorn Road, 40 feet on Severance Lane, 30 feet on Campbell Road, a 25 foot radius on the northeast corner of Elkhorn Road and Campbell Road, and a 20 foot radius on the southeast corner of Severance Lane and Campbell Road in accordance with Town Center standards prior to the issuance of any permits.
11. Construct half-street improvements including appropriate overpaving, if legally able, on Elkhorn Road, Severance Lane and Campbell Road adjacent to this site in accordance with Town Center standards concurrent with development of this site. Install all appurtenant underground facilities, if any, adjacent to this site needed for the future traffic signal system concurrent with development of this site.
12. Provide a minimum of two lanes of paved, legal access to this site along a logical route concurrent with development of this site.
13. Coordinate with the Collection Systems Planning Section of the Department of Public Works to extend oversized public sewer in Elkhorn Road from El Capitan Way to the west edge of this development to a location and depth acceptable to the City Engineer. All required public sewer easements, if any, necessary to connect this site to the existing public sewer system shall be provided to the City prior to City approval of sewer construction plans, or the issuance of any offsite permits. Provide public sewer easements for all public sewers not located within existing public street right-of-way prior to the issuance of any permits.
14. Meet with the Traffic Engineering Representative in Land Development for assistance in the possible redesign of the proposed driveway access, on site circulation and parking lot layout prior to the submittal of any construction plans or the issuance of any permits, whichever may occur first. Gated driveways shall be designed, located and constructed in accordance with Standard Drawing #222a.
15. The design and layout of all onsite private circulation and access drives shall meet the approval of the Department of Fire Services prior to the issuance of any permits.
16. Construct sidewalk on at least one side of all access drives connecting this site to the adjacent public streets concurrent with development of this site; the connecting sidewalk shall extend from the sidewalk on the public street to the first intersection of the on-site roadway network; the connecting sidewalk shall be terminated on-site with a handicap ramp.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 35 – Z-0076-98(26)

CONDITIONS – Continued:

17. A Traffic Impact Analysis must be submitted to and approved by the Department of Public Works prior to the issuance of any building or grading permits or submittal of any construction drawings. Comply with the recommendations of the approved Traffic Impact Analysis prior to occupancy of the site. The City shall determine area traffic mitigation contribution requirements based upon information provided in the approved Traffic Impact Analysis; such monies shall be contributed prior to the issuance of any permits for this site. The Traffic Impact Analysis shall also include a section addressing Standard Drawings #234.1 #234.2 and #234.3 to determine additional right-of-way requirements for bus turnouts adjacent to this site, if any; dedicate all areas recommended by the approved Traffic Impact Analysis. All additional rights-of-way required by Standard Drawing #201.1 for exclusive right turn lanes and dual left turn lanes shall be dedicated prior to or concurrent with the commencement of on-site development activities unless specifically noted as not required in the approved Traffic Impact Analysis. Phased compliance will be allowed if recommended by the approved Traffic Impact Analysis. No recommendation of the approved Traffic Impact Analysis, nor compliance therewith, shall be deemed to modify or eliminate any condition of approval imposed by the Planning Commission or the City Council on the development of this site.
18. A Drainage Plan and Technical Drainage Study must be submitted to and approved by the Department of Public Works prior to the issuance of any building or grading permits or submittal of any construction drawings for this site, whichever may occur first. Provide and improve all drainageways recommended in the approved drainage plan/study. The developer of this site shall be responsible to construct such neighborhood or local drainage facility improvements as are recommended by the approved Drainage Plan/Study concurrent with development of this site. In lieu of constructing improvements, in whole or in part, the developer may agree to contribute monies for the construction of neighborhood or local drainage improvements, the amount of such monies shall be determined by the approved Drainage Plan/Study and shall be contributed prior to the issuance of any building or grading permits if allowed by the City Engineer.
19. Site development to comply with the Town Center Development Standards, all applicable conditions of approval for Z-0076-98, and all other site-related actions.

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING - Z-0093-00(4) - GRAND CANYON PARTNERS, LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY - Request for a Site Development Plan Review and a Reduction in the Amount of Required Parking Lot Landscaping FOR A PROPOSED 376-UNIT, TWO-STORY MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL APARTMENT DEVELOPMENT on 19.41 Acres adjacent to the east side of Grand Canyon Drive, approximately 1,300 feet north of Grand Teton Road (APN: 125-07-701-004), R-E (Residence Estates) Zone under Resolution of Intent to PD (Planned Development), Ward 6 (Mack).

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to conditions.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

BUCKLEY - APPROVED subject to staff's conditions and the added condition as follows:

- *All visual aspects of the garage building shall be similar in color and banding to reflect the same aesthetic features of the apartment development and clubhouse.*

- UNANIMOUS

Final Action

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing open.

ANDREW REED, Planning and Development, read the staff report and explained about the available access to the proposed apartment complex. The overall site layout is acceptable with a few exceptions pertaining to the pedestrian gates. Staff agreed to the variance of the landscape waiver.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning and Development Department
Item 36 – Z-0093-00(4)

MINUTES – Continued:

CHRIS GRANT, 3906 Cranston Drive, expressed his appreciation for the review of the site plan application and agreed with the conditions imposed with the exception of Condition No. 3. He mentioned that he received a phone call from the adjacent developer who was concerned about the direct access gate from the apartment complex into the Gateway Residential that is planned. He therefore recommended Condition No. 3 be deleted.

LOUISE RUSKAMP, 8500 Log Cabin Way, asked about the percentage of parking spaces that are covered garages and the number that are open spaces. MR. GRANT responded that there are 693 covered spaces and 240 open ones. MS. RUSKAMP also questioned how the developer planned to provide shade if the parking lot landscaping is reduced.

TODD FARLOW, 240 North 19th Street, conveyed that this project is similar to one other that was approved featuring slanted parking.

MR. REED explained that the zoning is currently P-D, where initially it was offices to the north and single family residential to the south. VICE-CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL commented that initially the developer was unaware of the zoning and the Planning Commission supported the mixed zoning use because of the connectivity of three parcels under one ownership. COMMISSIONER McSWAIN stated that there might be concern about the marketability of a project that would be adjacent to an apartment complex. VICE-CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL acknowledged that during the initial process, the developer pitched an interaction between apartment dwellers and residential/commercial. Now, they are having second thoughts about that concept.

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing closed.

(10:30 – 10:41)

3-2584

CONDITIONS:

Planning and Development

1. This Site Development Plan Review shall expire two years from date of final approval unless it is exercised or an Extension of Time is granted by the City Council.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning and Development Department
Item 36 – Z-0093-00(4)

CONDITIONS – Continued:

2. Two pedestrian gates shall be placed along the northern property line of the apartments to provide greater access between the offices to the north and the apartments to the south.
3. This approval shall be reviewed in one year, at which time the Planning Commission shall determine the most appropriate location for a pedestrian gate (to be constructed at the applicants expense) along the southern property line of the apartment site to provide greater access between the apartment development and the single-family subdivision to the south. If the design of the single-family subdivision has not been finalized at that time, staff is authorized to delay the review for a maximum of one year.
4. The setbacks shall be 20 feet from the exterior property lines of the development and 10 feet between buildings.
5. All development shall be in conformance with the site plan and building elevations, except as amended by conditions herein.
6. Landscaping and a permanent underground sprinkler system shall be installed as required by the Planning Commission or City Council and shall be permanently maintained in a satisfactory manner. [Failure to properly maintain required landscaping and underground sprinkler systems shall be cause for revocation of a business license.]
7. A landscaping plan must be submitted prior to or at the same time application is made for a building permit.
8. All mechanical equipment, air conditioners and trash areas shall be fully screened in views from the abutting streets. Air conditioning units shall not be mounted on rooftops.
9. Parking lot lighting standards shall be no more than 20 feet in height and shall utilize 'shoe-box' fixtures and downward-directed lights. Wallpack lighting shall utilize 'shoe-box' fixtures and downward-directed lights on the proposed building. Non-residential property lighting shall be directed away from residential property or screened, and shall not create fugitive lighting on adjacent properties.
10. All utility boxes exceeding 27 cubic feet in size shall meet the standards of Municipal Code Section 19A.12.050.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning and Development Department
Item 36 – Z-0093-00(4)

CONDITIONS – Continued:

11. A six-foot high decorative block wall, with at least 20 percent contrasting materials, shall be constructed along the side and rear property lines. Wall heights shall be measured from the side of the fence with the least vertical exposure above the finished grade, unless otherwise stipulated.
12. A fully operational fire protection system, including fire apparatus roads, fire hydrants and water supply, shall be installed and shall be functioning prior to construction of any combustible structures.
13. All City Code requirements and design standards of all City departments must be satisfied.

Public Works

14. Dedicate 40 feet of right-of-way adjacent to this site for Tee Pee Lane prior to the issuance of any permits for this site.
15. Construct half-street improvements on Tee Pee Lane and on Grand Canyon Drive adjacent to this site concurrent with development of this site. In addition, extend a minimum of two lanes of temporary paving from this site to the nearest paved improvements; additional paved access routes may be required if traffic patterns in the neighborhood so necessitate as determined by the Traffic Engineer. Install all appurtenant underground facilities, if any, adjacent to this site needed for the future traffic signal system concurrent with development of this site.
16. Coordinate with the Collection Systems Planning Section of the Department of Public Works to extend oversized public sanitary sewer to a location and depth acceptable to the City Engineer. In addition, extend public sewer in Tee Pee Lane to the north edge of this site. Provide public sewer easements for all public sewers not located within existing public street right-of-way prior to the issuance of any permits as required by the Department of Public Works. Improvement Drawings submitted to the City for review shall not be approved for construction until all required public sewer easements necessary to connect this site to the existing public sewer system have been granted to the City.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning and Development Department
Item 36 – Z-0093-00(4)

CONDITIONS – Continued:

17. A Drainage Plan and Technical Drainage Study must be submitted to and approved by the Department of Public Works prior to the issuance of any building or grading permits, submittal of any construction drawings, whichever may occur first. Provide and improve all drainageways recommended in the approved drainage plan/study. The developer of this site shall be responsible to construct such neighborhood or local drainage facility improvements as are recommended by the approved Drainage Plan/Study concurrent with development of this site. In lieu of constructing improvements, in whole or in part, the developer may agree to contribute monies for the construction of neighborhood or local drainage improvements, the amount of such monies shall be determined by the approved Drainage Plan/Study and shall be contributed prior to the issuance of any building or grading permits, whichever may occur first, if allowed by the City Engineer.
18. Site development to comply with all applicable conditions of approval for Z-93-00, the approved traffic impact analysis and all other site-related actions.

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING - U-0123-99(1) - S & S #2, LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY -
Request for a Review of Condition Number 3 of Special Use Permit U-0123-99 which prohibits the sale of individual containers of any size beer, wine coolers or screw cap wine in conjunction with the sale of beer and wine at a convenience store (AJ's Minimart) located at 400 North Eastern Avenue (APN: 139-36-210-003), R-3 (Medium Density Residential) Zone, under Resolution of Intent to C-1 (Limited Commercial) Ward 3 (Reese)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends DENIAL.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

BUCKLEY - DENIED – UNANIMOUS with QUINN, TRUESDELL and McSWAIN not voting.

Final Action

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing open.

ANDREW REED, Planning and Development, maintained that the justification letter submitted stated that the applicant is at a competitive disadvantage compared to similar retailers selling the same products in single containers. MR. REED affirmed that this condition is attached to all convenience store applications selling beer and wine.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning and Development Department
Item 37 – U-0123-99(1)

MINUTES – Continued:

S & S #2, LLC Owners, JUDGE STEVEN AND SHARON HABERFELD, presented a brief summary of their business venture from its acquisition back in 1996 to present day. MS. HABERFELD explained that at the time the business was purchased, the property was inhabited by derelicts and drug addicts and was a neighborhood eyesore. The HABERFELD'S at the time of purchase knew of the unconditional use permit for the sale of alcoholic beverages; however once they purchased the property they were informed that it had expired. MS. HABERFELD stated that people who patronize her store do not understand why single sales are prohibited. She believes her business is suffering and asked the Commission to support her request. She believes that as owners of an enterprising business, she and her husband have worked zealously to making this a stellar project and is conscientiously trying to avoid becoming another statistic if forced to shutdown their business. MS. HABERFELD stressed that if the condition says no single sales, then it should be totally banned and no one should be allowed to sell at all.

TODD FARLOW, 240 North 19th Street, related that he would not like to see or hear of adverse circumstances similar to what occurs in COUNCILMAN WEEKLY'S ward. He believes that if you make exceptions by allowing single sales, it will revert right back to how the area used to be.

Both CHAIRMAN GALATI and COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY spoke of the reasons behind the creation of the policy relating to no sale of single cans of liquor. CHAIRMAN GALATI expressed that since the inception of this policy, the Planning Commission has been consistent in enforcing that condition and he reminded JUDGE and MS. HABERFELD that when they first came in for the use permit, they had agreed to all of the conditions which included no single sales. JUDGE HABERFELD asked if the Commission would consider a temporary exception with a one-year review. COMMISSIONER McSWAIN contended that as a recommendation board and in this particular case, if a policy is not working across the board, she would be willing to recommend that the applicants be given a chance.

Responding to a statement by COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY, DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY BRYAN SCOTT responded that the CITY COUNCIL does have the ability to draft an ordinance for a City-wide ban.

COMMISSIONER GOYNES commented on same-case scenarios that have occurred in various areas within the City sector where individuals take advantage of the single sales while being chemically hindered and think nothing of walking down the street with singles in hand. COMMISSIONER GOYNES stated that communities need to be educated and having certain restrictions is a means of providing control.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning and Development Department
Item 37 – U-0123-99(1)

MINUTES – Continued:

There was no further discussion.

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing closed.

(10:41 – 11:11))

3-3136

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING - VAC-0001-02 - LBLVTC II, LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY -
Petition to Vacate excess public rights-of-way, generally located at the intersection of Smoke Ranch Road and Fire Mesa Street, and at the intersection of Peak Drive and Fire Mesa Street, Ward 4 (Brown)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

0

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

0

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to conditions.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

QUINN - APPROVED subject to staff's conditions – **UNANIMOUS** with **BUCKLEY** abstaining because he has performed legal work for the applicant.

To be heard by the City Council on 3/20/2002

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing open.

TROY JESCHKE, Planning and Development, explained that the proposed right of way will not eliminate any public access to the abutting parcels. The roadways are undeveloped.

SCOTT DUGGAN, Stanley Consultants, 5820 South Eastern Avenue, appeared on behalf of the applicant and concurred with staff's recommendations.

No one appeared in opposition.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning and Development Department
Item 38 – VAC-0001-02

MINUTES – Continued:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing closed.

(11:11 – 11:13)

4-670

CONDITIONS:

1. If Petition of Vacation VAC-0047-01 is approved, then this Petition of Vacation shall be revised to eliminate the portions of this vacation at the intersection of Smoke Ranch Road and Fire Mesa Street.
2. This Petition of Vacation shall be modified to retain 20-foot radii at the southwest and southeast corners of Peak Drive and Fire Mesa Street.
3. All public improvements, if any, adjacent to and in conflict with this vacation application are to be modified, as necessary, at the applicant's expense prior to the recordation of an Order of Vacation.
4. All development shall be in conformance with code requirements and design standards of all City departments.
5. Reservation of easements for the facilities of the various utility companies together with reasonable ingress thereto and egress therefrom shall be provided if required.
6. The Order of Vacation shall not be recorded until all of the above conditions have been met provided, however, that Condition #3 may be fulfilled for purposes of recordation by providing sufficient security for the performance thereof in accordance with the Subdivision Ordinance of the City of Las Vegas. City Staff is empowered to modify this application if necessary because of technical concerns or because of other related review actions as long as current City right-of-way requirements are still complied with and the intent of the vacation application is not changed. If applicable, a five foot wide easement for public streetlight and fire hydrant purposes shall be retained on all vacation actions abutting public street corridors that will remain dedicated and available for public use. Also, if applicable and where needed, public easement corridors and sight visibility or other easements that would/should cross any right-of-way being vacated must be retained.
7. If the Order of Vacation is not recorded within one (1) year after approval by the City Council or the Planning Commission does not grant an Extension of Time, then approval will terminate and a new petition must be submitted.

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING - VAC-0002-02 - WEST CHARLESTON BOULEVARD-JONES BOULEVARD, LIMITED PARTNERSHIP - Petition to Vacate U.S. Government Patent Reservations generally located South of Charleston Boulevard, 430 feet east of Jones Boulevard, Ward 1 (M. McDonald)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

0

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

0

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to conditions.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

TRUEDELL - APPROVED subject to staff's conditions – UNANIMOUS

To be heard by the City Council on 3/20/2002

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing open.

TROY JESCHKE, Planning and Development, stated that staff determined there would be no adverse affect on the abutting parcels; therefore, with the conditions as listed, staff recommended approval of the applicant's request.

CHANEY VELTMAN, Veltman Planning Design Group, 2921 North Tenaya Way, represented the applicant and concurred with staff's recommendations.

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning and Development Department
Item 39 – VAC-0002-02

MINUTES – Continued:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing closed.

(11:13 – 11:14)

4-733

CONDITIONS:

1. Retain a 20 foot wide City of Las Vegas Sewer Easement for future connection to the south, unless an alternate sewer access plan is submitted to and approved by the City Engineer prior to the recordation of the Order of Relinquishment of Interest.
2. All public improvements, if any, adjacent to and in conflict with this vacation application are to be modified, as necessary, at the applicant's expense prior to the recordation of an Order of Relinquishment of Interest.
3. Development of this site shall comply with all applicable conditions of approval for the Zoning Reclassifications (ZC-0121-71 and Z-0104-95) and all other subsequent site-related actions.
4. All development shall be in conformance with code requirements and design standards of all City Departments.
5. The Order of Relinquishment of Interest shall not be recorded until all of the above conditions have been met provided, however, that Condition # 2 may be fulfilled for purposes of recordation by providing sufficient security for the performance thereof in accordance with the Subdivision Ordinance of the City of Las Vegas. City Staff is empowered to modify this application if necessary because of technical concerns or because of other related review actions as long as current City right-of-way requirements are still complied with and the intent of the vacation application is not changed. If applicable, a five foot wide easement for public streetlight and fire hydrant purposes shall be retained on all vacation actions abutting public street corridors that will remain dedicated and available for public use. Also, if applicable and where needed, public easement corridors and sight visibility or other easements that would/should cross any right-of-way being vacated must be retained
6. If the Order of Relinquishment of Interest is not recorded within one (1) year after approval by the City Council or the Planning Director does not grant an Extension of Time, then approval will terminate and a new petition must be submitted.

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING - VAC-0003-02 - CLARK COUNTY - Petition to Vacate a portion of Kenyon Place between Shadow Lane and Desert Lane, Ward 5 (Weekly)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to conditions.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

GOYNES - APPROVED subject to staff's conditions – **UNANIMOUS** with **GALATI** abstaining because he has contracts with Clark County and **BUCKLEY** abstaining because his firm does legal work for Clark County.

NOTE: The initial approval motion by **COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY**, which carried unanimously with **CHAIRMAN GALATI** abstaining, was reconsidered pursuant to a motion by **VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL** when **COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY** realized that he should have abstained on the item. The subsequent motion carried unanimously with **CHAIRMAN GALATI** abstaining.

NOTE: **DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY BRYAN SCOTT** informed **CHAIRMAN GALATI** AND **COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY** that his office will research and determine whether there is a need to abstain on any other future related issues.

To be heard by the City Council on 3/20/2002

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning and Development Department
Item 40 – VAC-0003-02

MINUTES:

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing open.

TROY JESCHKE, Planning and Development, explained that staff has determined that the Vacation will not eliminate public access to any abutting parcels. The right of way is under-utilized and deadends.

ROY CLARK, 1555 South Rainbow, representing the applicant, concurred with staff's recommendations.

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

VICE CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing closed.

(11:14)

4-778

CONDITIONS:

1. Retain a 20 foot City of Las Vegas Sewer Easement for existing 8" sewer line unless an alternative public sewer service plan is submitted to and approved by the Department of Public Works prior to recordation of the Order of Vacation for this site.
2. Provide a plan for approval by the Department of Public Works showing how Kenyon Place to the east of the area contemplated by this vacation application shall be terminated in a manner acceptable to the Department of Public Works prior to recordation of an Order of Vacation for this site. Dedicate all additional right-of-way needed to terminate Kenyon Place prior to recordation of the Order of Vacation.
3. A Drainage Plan and Technical Drainage Study or other related drainage information acceptable to the Flood Control Section must be submitted to and approved by the Department of Public Works prior to the recordation of the Order of Vacation for this application. Appropriate drainage easements shall be reserved if recommended by the approved Drainage Plan/Study.
4. All public improvements, if any, adjacent to and in conflict with this vacation application are to be modified, as necessary, at the applicant's expense prior to the recordation of an Order of Vacation. Existing public streetlights shall be removed and returned to the City yard.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning and Development Department
Item 40 – VAC-0003-02

CONDITIONS:

5. All development shall be in conformance with code requirements and design standards of all City departments.
6. Reservation of easements for the facilities of the various utility companies together with reasonable ingress thereto and egress therefrom shall be provided if required.
7. The Order of Vacation shall not be recorded until all of the above conditions have been met provided, however, that Condition #4 may be fulfilled for purposes of recordation by providing sufficient security for the performance thereof in accordance with the Subdivision Ordinance of the City of Las Vegas. City Staff is empowered to modify this application if necessary because of technical concerns or because of other related review actions as long as current City right-of-way requirements are still complied with and the intent of the vacation application is not changed. If applicable, a five-foot wide easement for public streetlight and fire hydrant purposes shall be retained on all vacation actions abutting public street corridors that will remain dedicated and available for public use. Also, if applicable and where needed, public easement corridors and sight visibility or other easements that would/should cross any right-of-way being vacated must be retained.
8. If the Order of Vacation is not recorded within one (1) year after approval by the City Council or the Planning Commission does not grant an Extension of Time, then approval will terminate and a new petition must be submitted.

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING - VAC-0004-02 - CITY OF LAS VEGAS - Petition to Vacate a portion of Hargrove Avenue generally located west of Garwood Avenue, south of Oran K. Gragson Highway (US-95), Ward 1 (M. McDonald)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to conditions.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

GOYNES - APPROVED subject to staff's conditions – **UNANIMOUS** with **GALATI** abstaining.

To be heard by the City Council on 3/20/2002

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing open.

TROY JESCHKE, explained that the proposed Vacation will eliminate access to an abutting parcel. As a condition, the applicant will be required to provide an access easement.

Representing the City was RICHARD DANIELSON of the Department of Public Works and he concurred with staff's recommendations.

VICE-CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL asked what the City would gain by the Vacation. MR. DANIELSON replied that the overall scheme of the improvement is to build a senior center in the parking lot area of the Metro Substation. He stated that the Department of Public Works will work with staff to determine a new access into the development.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning and Development Department
Item 41 – VAC-0004-02

MINUTES – Continued:

SANDRA TORRES, Manager of the Westridge Apartment Complex, brought up several topics for discussion. The area residents are concerned about the height of the block wall because it will obstruct their visual view. In place, they would prefer a short two-foot retaining wall and an open lawn area. MR. DANIELSON clarified that the architects will ensure that there will be an appropriate access that is agreed upon by the existing residents. He also assured MS. TORRES that the building will be a one-story unit and there will be no walls surrounding that site.

COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY asked about the process when a Vacation is petitioned. BART ANDERSON confirmed that to initiate a Vacation, only a single property owner who abuts the right-of-way needs to initiate the application. He also noted for the record that Condition No. 1 states that prior to recording any Order of Vacation, a plan must be submitted and approved that indicates how access will be provided.

There was no further discussion.

VICE-CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL declared the Public Hearing closed.

(11:16 – 11:27)

4-833

CONDITIONS:

1. Provide a plan for approval by the Department of Public Works indicating how access to parcel 138-35-501-002 will continue to be provided, and how the area to be vacated may be incorporated into the surrounding parcels. Alternative access must be provided prior to recordation of an Order of Vacation for this site, and appropriate modifications to the existing public improvements shall be constructed concurrent with development or redevelopment of this site.
2. All public improvements, if any, adjacent to and in conflict with this vacation application are to be modified, as necessary, at the applicant's expense prior to the recordation of an Order of Vacation.
3. All development shall be in conformance with code requirements and design standards of all City departments.
4. Reservation of easements for the facilities of the various utility companies together with reasonable ingress thereto and egress therefrom shall be provided if required.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning and Development Department
Item 41 – VAC-0004-02

CONDITIONS – Continued:

5. The Order of Vacation shall not be recorded until all of the above conditions have been met provided, however, that Condition #2 may be fulfilled for purposes of recordation by providing sufficient security for the performance thereof in accordance with the Subdivision Ordinance of the City of Las Vegas. City Staff is empowered to modify this application if necessary because of technical concerns or because of other related review actions as long as current City right-of-way requirements are still complied with and the intent of the vacation application is not changed. If applicable, a five foot wide easement for public streetlight and fire hydrant purposes shall be retained on all vacation actions abutting public street corridors that will remain dedicated and available for public use. Also, if applicable and where needed, public easement corridors and sight visibility or other easements that would/should cross any right-of-way being vacated must be retained.
6. If the Order of Vacation is not recorded within one (1) year after approval by the City Council or the Planning Commission does not grant an Extension of Time, then approval will terminate and a new petition must be submitted.

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING - VAC-0005-02 - PERMA-BILT - Petition to Vacate U.S. Government Patent Reservations generally located adjacent to the northeast corner of the intersection of Elkhorn Road and Grand Canyon Drive, Ward 6 (Mack)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to conditions.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

QUINN - APPROVED subject to staff's conditions – **UNANIMOUS** with **TRUESDELL** not voting

To be heard by the City Council on 3/20/2002

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing open.

ANDREW REED, Planning and Development, explained that the proposed relinquishment will not have an adverse impact on abutting parcels and will facilitate the planned development of the parcels.

JEFFREY ARMSTRONG, VTN Nevada, 2727 South Rainbow Boulevard, concurred with staff and requested approval of the project.

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 42 – VAC-0005-02

MINUTES – Continued:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing closed.
(11:27 – 11:28)
4-1234

CONDITIONS:

1. A Drainage Plan and Technical Drainage Study or other related drainage information acceptable to the Flood Control Section must be submitted to and approved by the Department of Public Works prior to the recordation of the Order of Vacation for this application. Appropriate drainage easements shall be reserved if recommended by the approved Drainage Plan/Study.
2. All public improvements, if any, adjacent to and in conflict with this vacation application are to be modified, as necessary, at the applicant's expense prior to the recordation of an Order of Relinquishment of Interest.
3. Development of this site shall comply with all applicable conditions of approval for the Zoning Reclassification (Z-0035-01), Variance (V-0032-01), Special Use Permit (U-0064-01), and all other subsequent site-related actions.
4. All development shall be in conformance with code requirements and design standards of all City Departments.
5. The Order of Relinquishment shall not be recorded until all of the above conditions have been met provided, however, that Condition #2 may be fulfilled for purposes of recordation by providing sufficient security for the performance thereof in accordance with the Subdivision Ordinance of the City of Las Vegas. City Staff is empowered to modify this application if necessary because of technical concerns or because of other related review actions as long as current City right-of-way requirements are still complied with and the intent of the vacation application is not changed. If applicable, a five foot wide easement for public streetlight and fire hydrant purposes shall be retained on all vacation actions abutting public street corridors that will remain dedicated and available for public use. Also, if applicable and where needed, public easement corridors and sight visibility or other easements that would/should cross any right-of-way being vacated must be retained.
6. If the Order of Relinquishment of Interest is not recorded within one (1) year after approval by the City Council or an Extension of Time is not granted by the Planning Director, then approval will terminate and a new petition must be submitted.

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING - VAC-0006-02 - D.R. HORTON, INC. - Petition to Vacate excess public right-of-way generally located adjacent to the intersection of El Capitan Way and Ackerman Avenue, Ward 6 (Mack)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

0

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

0

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to conditions.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

TRUEDELL - APPROVED subject to staff's conditions - UNANIMOUS

To be heard by the City Council on 3/20/2002

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing open.

TROY JESCHKE, Planning and Development, indicated that the proposed vacation of unused and undeveloped right-of-way will not eliminate public access to any abutting parcels.

LUIS PALOR, CVL Consultants, 6280 South Valley View Boulevard, concurred with staff.

TODD FARLOW, 240 North 19th Street, questioned the impact of the trails along Ackerman and was advised by MR. PALOR that there would be none.

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 43 – VAC-0006-02

MINUTES – Continued:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing closed.
(11:28 - 11:29)
4-1279

CONDITIONS:

1. This Petition of Vacation shall be modified to retain a 20 foot radius at the southwest corner of Ackerman Avenue and El Capitan Way. In addition, appropriate easements for the Multi-Use Trail adjacent to the south edge of Ackerman Avenue shall be retained
2. All public improvements, if any, adjacent to and in conflict with this vacation application are to be modified, as necessary, at the applicant's expense prior to the recordation of an Order of Vacation.
3. All development shall be in conformance with code requirements and design standards of all City departments.
4. Reservation of easements for the facilities of the various utility companies together with reasonable ingress thereto and egress therefrom shall be provided if required.
5. The Order of Vacation shall not be recorded until all of the above conditions have been met provided, however, that Condition #2 may be fulfilled for purposes of recordation by providing sufficient security for the performance thereof in accordance with the Subdivision Ordinance of the City of Las Vegas. City Staff is empowered to modify this application if necessary because of technical concerns or because of other related review actions as long as current City right-of-way requirements are still complied with and the intent of the vacation application is not changed. If applicable, a five foot wide easement for public streetlight and fire hydrant purposes shall be retained on all vacation actions abutting public street corridors that will remain dedicated and available for public use. Also, if applicable and where needed, public easement corridors and sight visibility or other easements that would/should cross any right-of-way being vacated must be retained.
6. If the Order of Vacation is not recorded within one (1) year after approval by the City Council or the Planning Commission does not grant an Extension of Time, then approval will terminate and a new petition must be submitted.

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

NON-PUBLIC HEARING - ABEYANCE - SD-0029-01(1) - ATLANTIC RICHFIELD COMPANY ON BEHALF OF UNITED BROTHERS ENTERPRISES - Request for a Site Development Plan Review FOR AN APPROXIMATELY 800 SQUARE FOOT ADDITION TO AN APPROVED SERVICE STATION AND FULL-SERVICE CAR WASH on 0.92 Acres located adjacent to the northeast corner of Charleston Boulevard and Eastern Avenue (APN: 139-35-805-001), C-2 (General Commercial) Zone, Ward 3 (Reese)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff Recommends

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

QUINN - APPROVED subject to staff's conditions - UNANIMOUS

Final Action

MINUTES:

TROY JESCHKE, Planning and Development, stated that due to a discrepancy between the report heading and report content, the approved convenience store item needed to be brought back before the Planning Commission for a relatively minor alteration. Staff recommended approval and noted that this is a final action item. Inasmuch as the item is a result of staff error, the applicant was told they were not required to be present.

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

(11:29 – 11:31)

4-1327

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 44 – SD-0029-01(1)

CONDITIONS:

Planning and Development

1. Site development to comply with all previous conditions of approval for Site Development Plan Review SD-0029-01 and all other subsequent site related actions as required by the Planning and Development Department and Public Works Department.
2. This Site Development Plan Review shall expire two years from date of final approval unless it is exercised or an Extension of Time is granted by the City Council.
3. All development shall be in conformance with the site plan and building elevations, except as amended by conditions herein.
4. Landscaping and a permanent underground sprinkler system shall be installed as required by the Planning Commission or City Council and shall be permanently maintained in a satisfactory manner. [Failure to properly maintain required landscaping and underground sprinkler systems shall be cause for revocation of a business license.]
5. The landscape plan shall be revised and approved by Planning and Development Department staff, prior to the time application is made for a building permit, to reflect the conditions of approval of SD-0029-01.
6. A landscaping plan must be submitted prior to or at the same time application is made for a building permit.
7. All mechanical equipment, air conditioners and trash areas shall be fully screened in views from the abutting streets.
8. Parking lot lighting standards shall be no more than 20 feet in height and shall utilize ‘shoe-box’ fixtures and downward-directed lights. Wallpack lighting shall utilize ‘shoe-box’ fixtures and downward-directed lights on the proposed building. Non-residential property lighting shall be directed away from residential property or screened, and shall not create fugitive lighting on adjacent properties.
9. All utility boxes exceeding 27 cubic feet in size shall meet the standards of Municipal Code Section 19A.12.050.
10. A fully operational fire protection system, including fire apparatus roads, fire hydrants and water supply, shall be installed and shall be functioning prior to construction of any combustible structures.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 44 – SD-0029-01(1)

CONDITIONS - Continued:

11. All City Code requirements and design standards of all City departments must be satisfied.

Public Works

12. Site development to comply with all previous conditions of approval for Site Development Plan Review SD-29-01 and all other subsequent site related actions.

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

NON-PUBLIC HEARING - ABEYANCE - SD-0072-01 - H FACTOR - Request for a Site Development Plan Review FOR A PROPOSED 15,350 SQUARE FOOT CHILD CARE FACILITY (KLASSY KIDS ACADEMY) and a Reduction in the amount of required perimeter landscaping on 2.26 Acres on the east side of Durango Drive, approximately 347 feet south of Racel Street (APN: 125-09-401-003), U (Undeveloped) Zone [PCD (Planned Community Development) General Plan Designation], Ward 6 (Mack)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to conditions.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

TRUESDELL – ABEYANCE to 3/14/2002 – Motion carried with QUINN abstaining as Carter Burgess is the subcontractor to his firm

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing open.

ANDREW REED, Planning & Development Department, requested that this item be held in abeyance so that it can be considered together with the companion Variance scheduled to be heard at the 3/14/2002 Planning Commission meeting.

MARK FAKLER, 6655 Bermuda Avenue, appeared on behalf of the applicant and concurred with staff's abeyance request.

No one appeared in opposition.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 45 – SD-0072-01

MINUTES – Continued:

There was no further discussion.

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing closed.

(6:11 - 6:12)

1-270

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

NON-PUBLIC HEARING - **Z-0093-00(3)** - **STANPARK CONSTRUCTION COMPANY** - Request for a Minor Modification to the Grand Canyon Village Master Development Plan TO AMEND SECTIONS 3.3.1(b) REGARDING STREET LIGHTING AND 3.2.1(d) REGARDING MINIMUM STREET WIDTHS AND SIDEWALK REQUIREMENTS (APN's: 125-07-701-004 and 125-07-801-005), Ward 6 (Mack)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to conditions.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

TRUEDELL – APPROVED subject to conditions – UNANIMOUS

Final Action

MINUTES:

TROY JESCHKE, Planning and Development, advised that the minor modification has been adequately justified by the applicant. The changes are appropriate and will have no detrimental impact to the overall Grand Canyon Village Master Development.

JEFFREY ARMSTRONG, VTN Nevada, 2727 South Rainbow Boulevard, concurred with staff.

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

(11:31 - 11:33)

4-1390

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 46 – Z-0093-00(3)

CONDITIONS:

Planning and Development

1. Section 3.2.1(d) shall be amended as follows:

All streets internal to the plan within the single family development shall be private and shall conform the private street requirements as set forth in Section 18.12.100 of the Las Vegas Subdivision Ordinance. Private streets greater than 40 feet in width shall require a sidewalk on one side. All setbacks within the development shall be measured from back of sidewalk, if one exists; or from back of curb, where no sidewalk exists.

2. Section 3.3.1(b) shall be amended as follows:

Area lights shall be provided along all public and private streets. Lights standards, pole heights and attached lighting shall be scaled to the street dimension illumination requirements per code. Individual lot gas lamps may be used on private streets. In lieu of individual gas lamps, two (2) photo electric; coach/carriage lights installed on both sides of the garage door may be used.

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

NON-PUBLIC HEARING - Z-0068-85(60) - ORIGIN PARK, LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY - Request for a Site Development Plan Review and a Reduction in the Amount of Required Parking Lot Landscaping FOR A PROPOSED 93,390 SQUARE-FOOT OFFICE PARK on 8.43 Acres adjacent to the west side of Crimson Canyon Drive, and the south side of Prairie Falcon Road (APN: 138-15-410-009), C-PB (Planned Business Park) Zone, Ward 4 (Brown)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to conditions.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

QUINN - APPROVED subject to staff's conditions and amending Condition #3 from 20 feet in height to 25 foot - UNANIMOUS

To be heard by the City Council on 3/20/2002

NOTE: TRUESDELL disclosed that his company manages the common areas of Tech Park 1, but that would not affect his ability to vote on this item.

MINUTES:

TROY JESCHKE, Planning and Development, explained that access will be from a driveway cut on Crimson Canyon Drive and another on Prairie Falcon Road. There are nine proposed buildings on the site with parking surrounding the buildings. The submitted elevations portray one-story office buildings consisting of tilt-up concrete construction of a pink-beige color, desert beige accents and off-white entryway accents. Staff recommends approval.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 47 – Z-0068-85(60)

MINUTES – Continued:

JENNIFER LAZOVICH, 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, appeared on behalf of the applicant and concurred with all but Condition #3. She requested that the lighting governed by Condition #3 be modified from 20 feet in height to 25 feet. MR. JESCHKE responded that staff would not oppose such a modification.

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

(11:33 - 11:34)

4-1444

CONDITIONS:

Planning and Development

1. This Site Development Plan Review shall expire two years from date of final approval unless it is exercised or an Extension of Time is granted by the City Council.
2. All landscaping shall conform to the Las Vegas Urban Design Standards and Guidelines.
3. Wall-pack lighting on the front of the building shall utilize ‘shoe-box’ fixtures and downward-directed lights on the proposed buildings. Lighting standards within the parking lots shall be no more than 20 feet in height and shall utilize ‘shoe-box’ fixtures and downward-directed lights.
4. Bicycle parking shall be provided within, or directly adjacent to, the parking lot area at a conspicuous location (or locations). The minimum bicycle parking required shall be equivalent to the area of one standard parking stall or sufficient parking for a minimum of eight bicycles.
5. All development shall be in conformance with the site plan and building elevations, except as amended by conditions herein.
6. All landscaping shall be in conformance with the landscaping plan, except as amended by conditions herein.
7. Landscaping and a permanent underground sprinkler system shall be installed as required by the Planning Commission or City Council and shall be permanently maintained in a satisfactory manner. Failure to properly maintain required landscaping and underground sprinkler systems shall be cause for revocation of a business license.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 47 – Z-0068-85(60)

CONDITIONS – Continued:

8. All mechanical equipment, air conditioners and trash areas shall be fully screened from view from the abutting streets.
9. All utility boxes exceeding 27 cubic feet in size shall meet the standards of Municipal Code Section 19A.12.050(D).
10. A fully operational fire protection system, including fire apparatus roads, fire hydrants and water supply, shall be installed and shall be functioning prior to construction of any combustible structures.
11. All City Code requirements and design standards of all City departments must be satisfied.

Public Works

12. Construct all incomplete half-street improvements (sidewalk) on Crimson Canyon Drive and Prairie Falcon Road adjacent to this site concurrent with development of this site.
13. Coordinate with the Collection Systems Planning Section of the Department of Public Works to extend a public sewer stub along the east property line to the south to service Assessor Parcel Number 138-15-410-008 at a location and depth acceptable to the City Engineer. Provide public sewer easements for all public sewers not located within existing public street right-of-way prior to the issuance of any permits as required by the Department of Public Works. Improvement Drawings submitted to the City for review shall not be approved for construction until all required public sewer easements have been granted to the City.
14. Meet with the Traffic Engineering Representative in Land Development for assistance in the possible redesign of the proposed driveway access, on site circulation and parking lot layout prior to the submittal of any construction plans or the issuance of any permits, whichever may occur first. Driveways shall be designed, located and constructed in accordance with Standard Drawing #222a.
15. An update to the previously approved Drainage Plan and Technical Drainage Study must be submitted to and approved by the Department of Public Works prior to the issuance of any grading or building permits, or the submittal of any construction drawings. Provide and improve all drainageways as recommended in the approved drainage plan/study.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 47 – Z-0068-85(60)

CONDITIONS – Continued:

16. Site development to comply with all applicable conditions of approval for Z-68-85 and all other site-related actions.

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

NON-PUBLIC HEARING - Z-0026-92(9) - LAS VEGAS VALLEY WATER DISTRICT - Required Two Year Review of an approved Site Development Plan Review FOR A 4,032 SQUARE FOOT CHILD CARE CENTER IN THREE MODULAR BUILDINGS on 0.97 Acres adjacent to the east side of Valley View Boulevard, approximately 1,200 feet north of Charleston Boulevard (APN: 139-31-801-006), C-V (Civic) Zone, Ward 1 (M. McDonald)

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to conditions.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Location Map
2. Conditions For This Application
3. Staff Report

MOTION:

GOYNES - APPROVED subject to staff's conditions – **UNANIMOUS** with **GALATI** abstaining because Las Vegas Valley Water District is a client of his firm

To be heard by the City Council on 3/20/2002. **NOTE: Subsequent to the meeting it was determined that this action was final action and would not be heard by the City Council.**

MINUTES:

TROY JESCHKE, Planning and Development, indicated that the three modular buildings are located to the southeast entrance of the Las Vegas Valley Water District, located at Valley View Boulevard and Fulton Place. The modular buildings are buffered from the surrounding properties by landscaping along the Valley View frontage and within the site around the modulars. The continued use of the modulars on the site is appropriate in that the buildings do resemble permanent structures. Staff recommends approval, subject to conditions and with no further reviews in the future.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 48 – Z-0026-92(9)

MINUTES – Continued:

ERICA MOONUN, Las Vegas Valley Water District, 1001 South Valley View Boulevard, concurred with the conditions and requested approval.

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

(11:34 - 11:37)

4-1558

CONDITIONS:

Planning and Development

1. No additional reviews of this Site Development Plan Review [Z-0026-92(3)] shall be required.
2. Conformance to all applicable conditions of approval for Site Development Plan Review [Z-0026-92(3)].

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING - DB-0001-02 - CITY OF LAS VEGAS - Appointment of two (2) Planning Commissioners to the Las Vegas Downtown Casino Signage Overlay District Architectural Review Committee (LVDCPARC).

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

0

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

0

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to conditions.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Conditions For This Application - Not Applicable
2. Staff Report

MOTION:

BUCKLEY - APPROVED nomination of COMMISSIONERS TRUESDELL and EVANS - UNANIMOUS

To be heard by the City Council on 3/20/2002. **NOTE: Subsequent to the meeting it was determined that this item did not require a hearing before the City Council and was final action.**

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI nominated VICE-CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL and COMMISSIONER EVANS to sit on the Committee.

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

(11:37)
4-1622

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

ABEYANCE - TA-0038-01 - CITY OF LAS VEGAS - Discussion and possible action to amend the City of Las Vegas Zoning Code Title 19A.04.010 **TO ADD** Monorail as a permissible use by Special Use Permit in all zoning districts. In addition, Amend Title 19A.04.050 to establish criteria that must be met to obtain a Special Use Permit for a Monorail in all Zoning Districts. Further, to Amend Title 19A.02.020 to establish a definition for a Monorail

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to conditions.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Conditions For This Application - Not Applicable
2. Staff Report

MOTION:

TRUEDELL - APPROVED subject to conditions, amending Condition #1 and #6B as follows:

1. Any Special Use Permit for a private monorail shall only be approved by the City Council after receipt of the recommendation of the Planning Commission and concurrent with *or subsequent to* the approval of a *monorail agreement pursuant to Nevada Law*.
- 6B. If the height of the wall exceeds *eight* feet, a *Variance shall be required*.
– Motion carried with BUCKLEY abstaining because his firm works for the monorail franchisee

To be forwarded to City Council in ordinance form

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing open.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 50 – TA-0038-01

MINUTES – Continued:

ROBERT GENZER, Director, Planning and Development Department, explained that in an effort to be proactive with regard to a future monorail route through the areas of the City, especially downtown, an amendment to Title 19A is warranted. Currently, Title 19A does not address the monorail as an allowable use within the City of Las Vegas. This amendment would allow the route and ancillary uses involved with this mode of transport by means of Special Use Permit in all zoning districts within the City. The City, in an attempt to allow the development of a monorail that will traverse both the County and City lines, is proposing that this entitlement process for approval of this use mirror as closely as possible to that which was already approved by the County. This would allow development to occur in both jurisdictions with equal entitlement powers for both governing bodies and provide essentially for a seamless transition from one jurisdiction to the next.

MR. GENZER added that seven conditions would be required for the Special Use Permit and read into the record amendments to Condition #1 and #6B. Further, the approval of the Special Use Permit will not give the applicant the right to use the property of any other person without the property owners expressed written consent and may not serve as the basis to compel the City of Las Vegas to use its power of eminent domain to acquire the property of non-consenting owners. As part of this proposal, a definition for monorail will be included in Title 19A 20.020.

MR. GENZER clarified for VICE-CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL that the signage requirements would be found in Title 19A.14.

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing closed.

(6:16 - 6:21)

1-445

CONDITIONS:

1. Any Special Use Permit for a private monorail shall only be approved by the City Council after receipt of the recommendation of the Planning Commission and concurrent with the approval of a franchise agreement as provided under Chapter 6.00 of the City of Las Vegas Municipal Code (Franchised Monorail Transportation Systems).

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 50 – TA-0038-01

CONDITIONS – Continued:

2. Conditions shall apply to associated passenger terminals, power propulsion systems, parking lots, maintenance facilities, and other accessory land and buildings contained in the application submittal.
3. Accessory commercial uses are permitted in conjunction with the system and shall be specified in a Special Use Permit application.
4. Structures shall be designed to be architecturally compatible with existing buildings and structures in the vicinity of the system and are permitted at heights greater than otherwise permitted by this Title providing the height of the structures is specified in the Special Use Permit application.
5. Site development standards, including yard setbacks, building separation or location required may be reduced or eliminated.
6. Ground level equipment, power propulsion systems and maintenance facilities shall be screened from streets and residential development as follows:
 - a. Must be screened with a decorative block wall not to exceed 10 feet in height and/or landscaping sufficient to screen the facility as determined by the Planning Commission or City Council.
 - b. If the height of the wall exceeds six feet, a notarized letter of approval shall be obtained from the owner of an adjacent developed property.
7. Signs are permitted as follows:
 - a. On buildings subject to the requirements of Title 19A.14.

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING - TA-0040-01 - CITY OF LAS VEGAS - Discussion and possible action to Amend Title 19A.08 and Title 19A.12 to address various commercial development standards

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to conditions.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Conditions For This Application - Not Applicable
2. Staff Report

MOTION:

TRUESDELL – ABEYANCE to 3/14/2002 - UNANIMOUS

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing open.

ROBERT GENZER, Director, Planning & Development Department, stated that staff does not object to an abeyance request made by industry members. However, he asked that FRANK FIORE, Comprehensive Planning, who for the past years has diligently worked on this process, make a presentation to the Board.

MR. FIORE explained that the Commercial Development Standards have been through the process for approximately a year and a half. The development standards have been created for both City staff reviewing the projects, as well as the development community in planning and designing new commercial projects so that they have a better and clearer understanding of the City of Las Vegas' vision. The purposes of the standards are to promote improved design and enhanced site planning of commercial development; encourage sensitive design and planning of

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 51 – TA-0040-01

MINUTES – Continued:

commercial development which enhances compatibility between the built and natural environment; promote design and site planning which furthers the goals of the City of Las Vegas Master Plan 2020; promote design and site planning which advances the vision of the City of Las Vegas; and promote commercial development which enhances the quality of life for the citizens of Las Vegas.

MR. FIORE outlined some of the goals, objectives and policies of the proposed development standards, such as enhancement of the visual quality of new development within the City, and enhancement of the City's urban design standards as it relates to site landscaping and building design for new developments. Additionally, other objectives deal with regional issues regarding site design and planning in regards to drainage areas, and to ensure that watercourses throughout the City are integrated with urban development in a manner that protects the integrity of the water and minimizes erosions. The City shall work with Clark County Regional Flood Control District and local development industry to integrate natural stream channels and drainage courses into urban development in as natural a state as possible. Areas along the edges of hard-lined flood control facilities and along natural drainage courses shall be utilized as areas for public trails and walkways with landscaping and other structures, which enhance the appearance of these sites. Included in the goals, objectives and policies are pedestrian walkways.

These standards were developed by a comprehensive planning team in conjunction with current planning and have been presented at the quarterly Planning Commission workshop. Other City of Las Vegas departments reviewed these standards as they might impact and might need to be implemented by those departments. Comments have been received and incorporated into the proposed development standards. In addition, a draft of the proposed standards were sent to organizations such as (NAIOP) National Association for Industrial Office Properties, (AIA) National Institute of Architects, (ASLA) American Society of Landscape Architects, and the Southern Nevada Homebuilders, for their comments. Those comments were reviewed and changes were made. In November of 2001 notices were sent out and six public meetings were held in each City Council Ward. During that time notices were sent to developers, realtors, professionals, various architectural engineering firms and law firms that were interested in receiving notices. Also 192 notices were sent to community organizations, such as homeowner associations, and notices were published in the newspaper as well. Even though attendance was not high, many comments were received. Again, those comments, mostly positive, were included in the proposed development standards. In addition to public meetings, the Public Information Office produced an informational piece and aired it on City Beat on Channel 2 explaining the purpose of the development standards and their contents.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 51 – TA-0040-01

MINUTES – Continued:

MR. FIORE explained that currently Title 19A.08.050 is entitled Commercial and Industrial District Development Standards, but because of concerns from some of the development organizations that this might apply to industrial, the word “Commercial” was removed. The table at the end of that section indicating both commercial and industrial uses was changed to reflect only the industrial uses. Additionally, the section on landscape, wall and buffer requirements and many of the items that dealt specifically with landscaping in the commercial development standards was pulled out of those standards and incorporated into Title 19A12. Staff felt that this would make a lot easier for staff, as well as the development community to follow.

VICE-CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL commented that closing trash enclosures should be encouraged, especially in the downtown area. He would like to see an alternative for shared compactor requirements to better address some of the mischief that goes on in the service areas of buildings in the downtown area. He also asked MR. FIORE whether drive-thru facilities such as banks were included in the standards. MR. FIORE replied that these were not included in the standards at this time. The only reference is to the side of the buildings. What staff is looking for is to bring a building to the front of the site with landscaping between the sidewalk and the front of the building. However, if a building has a drive-thru facility, they would be allowed to put a single lane of drive-thru on that side of the building, between the landscaping and the building. Regarding the trash enclosures, MR. FIORE noted that the trash enclosures, as the draft states, are required to have solid walls and be secured by metal gates on the front. A previous draft required that they have a roof. However, that was changed due to concerns from the development community that instead of requiring the roof, that it have landscaping tall enough to obscure the ability to look down into the trash enclosures. VICE-CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL replied that his concern is not someone looking down into a dumpster enclosure but the fact that trash enclosures are becoming secondary housing units in the downtown area. Even though gates can be locked and secured, people can still be found in those areas. He reiterated that it should be a requirement to enclose the trash enclosures, a simple solution today to make sure there will be safer projects tomorrow.

CHAIRMAN GALATI stated that he has been waiting for these development standards for some time. He applauded staff’s efforts for the graphics showing exactly what they mean, not only for the Board but also for anyone developing a project.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 51 – TA-0040-01

MINUTES – Continued:

JENNIFER LAZOVICH, 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, appeared on behalf of Focus Commercial Group, Montecito and Territory Inc. She asked for a 30-day abeyance to give her clients the opportunity to review the proposed standards and perhaps meet with Planning staff to address any comments or concerns they might have, since they did not attend the public meetings or workshops.

CHAIRMAN GALATI indicated that he also received a telephone call from a member of NAIOP, with a similar request. While they did not have any major concerns with the standards, there were a few people who did not get a chance to review them.

COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY asked staff if the Town Center Standards projects have separate standards. MR. FIORE replied in the affirmative adding that the proposed standards will not apply to any master planned development or special area plan that has its own designed guidelines. For instance, the design guidelines within the Downtown Centennial Plan would take precedence over these guidelines. The proposed development standards are designed to take into consideration the majority of the suburban development that is going in areas outside some of the master planned areas.

VICE-CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL commended staff for the comprehensive job of ensuring that everyone was included in the process. If there is not an issue of timing, he indicated that he would support the abeyance for 30 days. With regard to downtown, the dumpster enclosure issue is a major issue and VICE-CHAIRMAN TRUESDELL believes that it will become a suburban issue in the future. Therefore, the dumpster enclosures should be comprehensively included throughout the standards. COMMISSIONER BUCKLEY concurred with the abeyance request indicating that there is no reason why staff could not look at projects, review them to see if they meet the new standards and ensure that, even if they are not universally adopted, they could move forward to achieve these standards in all projects.

CHAIRMAN GALATI disclosed that he is a member of NAIOP, as well as a member of the AIA.

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing closed.

(6:21 - 6:39)

4-603

AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE - PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

DEPARTMENT: PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

DIRECTOR: ROBERT S. GENZER

☐

CONSENT

☒

DISCUSSION

SUBJECT:

PUBLIC HEARING - TA-0001-02 - CITY OF LAS VEGAS - Discussion and possible action to Amend Title 19A.18 and Title 19A.20 to include the term "Project of Regional Significance" and its definition as adopted by the Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition and to add a new section which outlines the procedures for Projects of Regional Significance

PROTESTS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

APPROVALS RECEIVED BEFORE:

Planning Commission Mtg.

City Council Meeting

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends APPROVAL, subject to conditions.

BACKUP DOCUMENTATION:

1. Conditions For This Application - Not Applicable
2. Staff Report

MOTION:

TRUEDELL - APPROVED - UNANIMOUS

To be forwarded to City Council in ordinance form

MINUTES:

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing open.

FRANK FIORE, Comprehensive Planning, explained that the Legislature created the Southern Nevada Regional Planning Coalition. One of the tasks given to the municipalities in Southern Nevada who were required to be part of that Regional Planning Coalition, was to come up with a definition of projects of regional significance and establish a process to handle those issues. Title 19A.18.020 would be amended to add the definition of Projects of Regional Significance that staff currently looks at and then require developers to provide staff with additional information and analysis under State Statute. This would ensure that any projects that come before the City

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 14, 2002
Planning & Development Department
Item 52 – TA-0001-02

MINUTES – Continued:

as a tentative map or a planned unit development of 500 units or more, toward the combination of 300 units or more, commercial or industrial facilities generating more than 6,250 average daily trips or non-residential development encompassing more than 160 acres, will cross that threshold. Staff would then be required to do zoning maps and local land use amendments or a special use permit that is within 500 feet of the boundary of that adjacent municipality. This provides a process for projects that fall within a half mile of the City of Las Vegas' boundary or a special use permit that is within 500 feet of the boundary of the City of Las Vegas. That particular entity would have to notify the City of Las Vegas and send an application to be reviewed so that the City could comment on that project and that particular entity would have to let the City know how they would address those issues.

No one appeared in opposition.

There was no further discussion.

CHAIRMAN GALATI declared the Public Hearing closed.

(6:39 - 6:43)

1-1241



AGENDA SUMMARY PAGE
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF: FEBRUARY 14, 2002

CITIZENS PARTICIPATION:

Items raised under this portion of the Planning Commission agenda cannot be deliberated or acted upon until the notice provisions of the Open Meeting Law have been met. If you wish to speak on a matter not listed on the agenda, please step up to the podium and clearly state your name and address. In consideration of others, avoid repetition, and limit your comments to no more than three (3) minutes. To ensure all persons equal opportunity to speak, each subject matter will be limited to ten (10) minutes.

No one appeared to speak under this portion of the agenda.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 11:39 P.M.

Respectfully submitted:

ANGELA CROLLI, DEPUTY CITY CLERK

DEENY ARAUJO, DEPUTY CITY CLERK